

302180

JPRS-TAC-85-022

5 August 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

19980828 107

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

10  
92  
Aφ5

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the

~~original but have been supplied as appropriate in context.~~

Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

5 August 1985

## WORLDWIDE REPORT

### ARMS CONTROL

#### GENERAL

USSR's Ponomarev Discusses Arms Issues With Visiting UK MP's (Moscow TASS, 9, 16 Jul 85) .....	1
SDI, Test Ban, INF	1
Luncheon Speeches	4
Final Meeting,	5

#### U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

IZVESTIYA: U.S. Using Talks as 'Smokescreen' for SDI (V. Kuznetsov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 17 Jul 85) .....	7
Moscow: Soviet 'Concern' Over U.S. Stance; Gorbachev Cited (Moscow in English to North America, 29 Jun 85) .....	9
PRAVDA Sees U.S.-European Rift on Arms Control (G. Vorontsov; Moscow PRAVDA, 10 Jul 85) .....	11
Italian General Writes in Soviet Weekly, Criticizes U.S. Stance (Nino Pasti; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 27, Jul 85) .....	14
TASS Reports Concluding Sessions of Second Round (Moscow TASS, 11, 16 Jul 85) .....	18
INF Group 11 July	18
Plenary Meeting 16 July	18
Soviet Envoy, Media View Second Round Results (Moscow, various sources, various dates) .....	19
Karpov Cites Gorbachev Speech	19
Karpov: No Progress, by V. Polzikov	20
Possible 'Reappraisal' of Talks, Editorial	21
TASS: Geneva Results 'Unsatisfactory'	22
Moscow Radio on Geneva, Summit, by Igor Surguchev	23

PRAVDA Denies Any Change in Soviet Position of Space Arms (Moscow PRAVDA, 13 Jul 85) .....	24
Soviet People Appeal for Progress at Talks (Moscow TASS, 15 Jul 85) .....	25
Soviet Analyst Stresses Importance of Arms Moratorium (Moscow in English to North America, 13 Jul 85) .....	27
Soviet Delegate Denies NEW YORK TIMES Report of SDI Compromise (Belgrade TANJUG, 10 Jul 85) .....	29

#### SPACE ARMS

Further Soviet Comments on Bush SDI European Tour (Moscow, various sources, various dates) .....	30
Antimissile Demonstrations in Netherlands	30
'Blackmail' in UK	30
U.S.-European Differences Remain, by Vitaliy Gan	31
Army Paper Sees Failure, by Ye. Nikitin	32
European Fears Highlighted	33
Claim of European Support Denied	34
Soviet June-July Commentaries Assailing SDI (Moscow, various sources, various dates) .....	35
U.S. Seeks ABM Revision, by Vladimir Teplov	35
Defensive Purposes 'Fraud'	36
ABM Treaty, SDI 'Mutually Exclusive'	37
'Aggressive Nature' Seen, by Melor Sturua	38
Reagan Said Shifting Excuse	39
Weinberger Comments Ridiculed, by A. Zagorskiy	40
Soviet June-July Comments on European Response to SDI (Moscow, various sources, various dates) .....	41
U.S. Treats Allies as Children	41
Kohl Remarks Contradictory	43
FRG Defense Minister Hit	43
Brandt on INF, SDI	44
Opposition Grows, by Boris Parkhomenko	45
UK Article on Subcontracting Cited	45
Japanese-French Differences	46
TASS Reports Paris Conference on Eureka Project (Moscow TASS, 17 Jul 85) .....	47
PRAVDA Examines Japanese Attitude to SDI Participation (Y. Dalnev; Moscow PRAVDA, 9 Jul 85) .....	48
Soviet Army Paper on May NSC Directive 172 on SDI (V. Chernyshev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 13 Jul 85) .....	52



IZVESTIYA: International Conference in Sweden Hits SDI (A. Sychev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 9 Jul 85) .....	54
USSR Marshal Akhromeyev Writes in Spanish Paper on SDI, ABM Treaty (S. Akhromeyev; Madrid MUNDO OBRERO, 11-17 Jul 85) .....	55
SALT/START ISSUES	
USSR: U.S. Sub Plans Violate SALT II (Radomir Bodganov Interview; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, 7 Jul 85) .....	59
Moscow Broadcast to Britain on Reagan SALT II Decision (Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 28 Jun 85) .....	61
IZVESTIYA Condemns CIA Report on Soviet ICBM's (V. Soldatov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 10 Jul 85) .....	63
Moscow Denies Pentagon Accusation of Arms Violation (Moscow Domestic Service, 10 Jul 85) .....	64
PRAVDA: Midgetman Program Will Complicate Summit, Geneva Talks (Moscow PRAVDA, 10 Jul 85) .....	66
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
PRAVDA Denies Bush Claim That SS-20 Deployments Continue (Moscow PRAVDA, 20 Jul 85) .....	68
TASS Hits FRG Missile Acquisitions Policy (Moscow TASS, 16 Jul 85) .....	69
CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE	
USSR's Grinevskiy Hits U.S. 'Negative Stance' (Moscow TASS, 15 Jul 85) .....	70
Soviet-Austrian Consultations (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 12 Jul 85) .....	71
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
Further Soviet Comment on U.S. Binary Arms Program (Moscow, various sources, various dates) .....	72
TASS Statement .....	72
Professor Discusses Legal Aspects .....	73
Moscow TV Commentary, by Georgiy Zubkov .....	73
TASS Cites Japanese Paper on U.S. Pacific Chemical War Plans (Moscow TASS, 9 Jul 85) .....	75

## NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: Greek Call for Balkan Zone Cited (Moscow, various sources, various dates) .....	76
Papandreou Speech, by N. Miroshnik Protests Against U.S. Bases .....	76 77
TASS: New Zealand Plans Law Banning Nuclear-Capable Warships (Moscow TASS, 8 Jul 85) .....	78
Moscow on July ANZUS Meeting: 'Anti-Nuclear Chain Reaction' Seen (Moscow Domestic Service, 15 Jul 85) .....	79
IZVESTIYA Commentary on Indian Ocean Peace Zone (Vladimir Kudryavtsev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 7 Jul 85) .....	80

## NUCLEAR TESTING

U.S. Center for Defense Information Appeals for Moratorium (Moscow, various sources, various dates) .....	83
Gorbachev Replies .....	83
Moscow TV Interviews La Rocque .....	84
TASS Cites Research Paper .....	84
Moscow Hits U.S. Attitude .....	85

GENERAL

USSR'S PONOMAREV DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES WITH VISITING UK MP'S

SDI, Test Ban, INF

LD091918 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 9 Jul 85

[Excerpts]

Moscow July 9 TASS -- Talks have been held in the Kremlin today between the delegations of the Commissions for Foreign Affairs of the Chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom.

Taking part in the meeting were:

From the Soviet side -- B.N. Ponomarev, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, chairman of the Commission for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet (head of the delegation); L.M. Zamyatin, secretary of the Commission for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet; G.A. Zhukov, R.I. Kosolapov, Z.M. Kruglova, S.A. Losev, P.A. Naumov, A.M. Subbotin, A.N. Yakovlev, members of the Commissions for Foreign Affairs; V.P. Suslov, member of the collegium of the USSR Foreign Ministry; K.F. Mikhailov, deputy chief of the Main Administration of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR.

From the British side -- Anthony Kershaw, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom (head of the delegation); members of the House of Commons N.A. John-Stevas, D.A. Canavan, J.T. Lester, I.D. Lawrence, I. Mikardo, N. Spearing, P.J. Thomas, P.B. Wells, M.C. Welsh, R.L. Harvey; committee secretary H.A. Proctor; second secretary of the committee K.D. Poizer; and second secretary of the British Embassy in Moscow J. Edgar.

Opening the meeting, Boris Ponomarev pointed out that British-Soviet parliamentary contacts have been recently invigorated after a break of many years. Late last year a visit to Britain was paid by a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Mikhail Gorbachev. That visit has contributed to creating a more favourable climate in relations between our two countries. In this tense and dangerous age such a mutual understanding is particularly important. And it is the duty of everyone to do everything humanly possible to avert nuclear war, to preserve peace and civilization.

The Soviet Union combines its peaceful creative activities in the country with the defence of peace and security of peoples. Peace, wellbeing and progress are the vital problems resolved by the Soviet people, which lost many millions of lives and suffered

enormous material losses during the Second World War, and therefore, knows particularly well and feels keenly the high value of peace.

This determines the chief direction in the USSR's foreign policy: Preventing nuclear catastrophe, pressing for a radical improvement of the international situation, ensuring conditions for a sharp reduction and, ultimately, total elimination of nuclear weapons. The whole of foreign policy activity of the Soviet leadership is directed at attaining these goals.

"In our country," B.N. Ponomarev said, "you will not find classes or social groups that are interested in war, in profits from work for war. The Soviet Union has no expansionist plans of any kind, we do not need other peoples' territories. We are quite satisfied with our own resources. The whole of the CPSU's policy is permeated with the ideas of construction, is oriented at lofty humane ideals.

Our ambitious plans of perfecting socialist society are aimed at peaceful construction. The 27th congress of the party will adopt a new edition of the programme that will look far into the 21st century. And this is the best graphic proof that the USSR has not aggressive, bellicose intentions whatsoever which are ascribed to us in the west.

Describing the situation in the international arena, B.N. Ponomarev stressed that it remained difficult and dangerous. The root cause of such a situation is that the administration of the United States supported by its NATO allies, in spite of all peaceable declarations, is stubbornly trying to ensure military superiority for itself. Washington wants to upset at any cost the strategic balance that has taken shape in the world. The process of qualitative improvement of all types of weapons is under way, and new lethal systems are in development. Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" is aimed at undermining the Soviet deterrence capability and acquiring the possibility to launch nuclear attacks with impunity.

Of course, the Soviet Union will be able to find a proper antidote to American space strike weapons. It will not allow a military superiority over itself, as it was repeatedly stated by the Soviet leadership. However, it opposes the launching of new rounds in the exhausting and dangerous race of space and nuclear armaments, which would result in the further, practically unlimited, accumulation of mountains of nuclear and other weapons of mass annihilation. The American "star wars" programme provides not only for research work, but also for large-scale testing of components of space-based strike weapons in the very near future, while some of them are already being tested.

Leading scientists, major experts both in the United States and in other countries sternly warn: This should not be done, no one will profit, while all can be the losers. It is also known that very many politicians and statesmen oppose the militarization of outer space, this sinister activity. A large-scale anti-war movement is mounting.

Regrettably, the White House brushes the authoritative warnings aside.

At the talks in Geneva, the Soviet Union made clear to the American side that there can be no agreement on nuclear arms reduction without an accord banning the development (including scientific research) of space strike weapons. And, on the contrary, given reciprocal renunciation of the militarization of outer space, the Soviet side is prepared for radical reductions of strategic offensive armaments and medium-range nuclear systems.

The present U.S. Administration, B.N. Pnomarev observed, has embarked on a course towards destroying the treaty system that continues to restrain to a certain degree the race of nuclear and space armaments.

Great Britain could play an important role in improving the international climate. Let us take, for instance, the proposal for resuming the tripartite talks between the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain on a total ban on nuclear tests.

The Soviet Union repeatedly expressed its readiness for that. When the United States raises objections to the ratification of treaties on underground explosions, it brings forth the argument about the need to improve a control system. But the treaty on the total termination of tests does not need refined methods of control. Each violation would be registered automatically. The conclusion of such a treaty would make it possible to erect effective barriers in the way of the perfection of nuclear weapons. To make the matters more simple, the Soviet Union recently announced its readiness to introduce a moratorium on any nuclear explosions if other nuclear powers act likewise.

We think that Great Britain, as a country participating in the tripartite talks, could play a positive role in resolving this major problem.

The pledge that, in case Great Britain reduces its nuclear forces, the Soviet Union, for its part, will also reduce its intermediate-range forces by the same amount remains in force. This pledge was made back in May 1983 and reiterated in November 1984 during the visit of Neil Kinnock to Moscow.

Neither in the past nor at present has the Soviet Union raised the question concerning some measures with respect to nuclear forces of Britain and France. But as long as that nuclear missile capability is preserved -- and NATO member-countries themselves count it in the over-all balance of forces -- the USSR cannot but preserve its corresponding counter-balance.

But all these problems could be resolved along the lines of goodwill and in the spirit of mutual understanding.

Great Britain could also accomplish much for ensuring a durable peace in Europe. For Europe is not simply a geographical notion but our common home. European nations have a common cultural heritage, they have made an immense contribution to the world civilisation. The USSR and Britain jointly defended Europe from Hitlerite fascism. This should be remembered. Despite all the difference of European countries from one another, they have a common interest -- to live in peace, cooperate in economic matters and in resolving cardinal international problems. This important similarity is recorded in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference the tenth anniversary of which will be marked shortly.

The Soviet Union favours all-round consolidation of all-European security and European peaceful cooperation. The USSR builds its European policy on the basis of the Helsinki Final Act and intends to pursue this policy in an active, persistent and consistent way, seeking the expansion of a constructive dialogue and cooperation with Western Europe. This is one of the major directions in Soviet foreign policy.

The USSR regards nuclear disarmament in Europe and a total elimination of medium-range and tactical weapons here as its top priority task.

Establishing relations in economic affairs between the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the European Economic Community would become a step towards developing all-European cooperation. To the extent to which the EEC countries act as a "political

entity", we are prepared to look for a common language with it on concrete international issues as well.

In general, the point at issue is the joint search for ways to revive detente, strengthen security in Europe and prevent nuclear catastrophe.

In conclusion, calling upon the British MP's to promote the development of Soviet-British relations which are an important element of the policy of peace, B.N. Ponomarev stressed that efforts to do so were hindered by such an inadmissible phenomenon as anti-Sovietism which had no rational grounds and was built on disinformation and inventions. The stationing in Great Britain of U.S. first-strike missiles aimed at the Soviet Union also cannot but have its effect on Soviet-British relations. Exactly these missiles constitute a threat to peace in Europe, and not the alleged "Soviet military threat" which never existed and does not exist. We are impressed that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Commons wants to make its contribution toward improving Soviet-British relations in a variety of fields. Our delegation welcomes such a desire and expresses the hope that you -- the committee as a whole and each of you personally -- will strive to work for the benefit of peace and good-neighborliness.

Anthony Kershaw expressed gratitude to the USSR Supreme Soviet for the invitation extended to the delegation of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom. In his speech he expressed concern over the arms race continuing in the world, over the destiny of peace. Progress in the field of disarmament is the aim, for which we must strive, Anthony Kershaw continued. Nevertheless, touching upon the problem of the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" of the USA and a number of related issues, he was speaking in the spirit of the usual propositions characteristic of the NATO leadership.

Then speaking in the subsequent discussion from the Soviet side were deputies L.M. Zamyatin, G.A. Zhukov, R.I. Kosolapov, Z.M. Kruglova, S.A. Losev, A.M. Subbotin, Lieutenant General K.F. Mikhailov, and from the British side British MP's N.D. John-Stevas, D.A. Canavan, J.T. Lester, I.D. Lawrence, I. Mikardo, N. Spearing, P.J. Thomas, P.B. Wells, M.C. Welsh, R.L. Harvey.

The meeting between the MP's of the two countries will be continued.

#### Luncheon Speeches

LD091441 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 9 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS -- "The chief aim of mankind is to preserve peace for the present and succeeding generations. This is the essence of the Soviet foreign policy," said Boris Ponomarev, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, alternate member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU. He spoke at a luncheon given today on behalf of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the two chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet (Soviet Parliament) in honor of a delegation of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Commons of British Parliament.

The delegation, led by the committee chairman John Anthony Kershaw, arrived in Moscow yesterday at the invitation of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

"At present," Boris Ponomarev went on to say, "millions of people are extremely worried over the military menace, including from outer space. The Soviet Union is consistently working for peace. Our country has repeatedly proposed specific measures to ensure non-use of force and promote disarmament. This principled policy is dictated by our social system."

Boris Ponomarev expressed the hope that during the tour of the Soviet Union, "The delegation will see for itself that the Soviet people are peaceable."

In his reply at the luncheon John Kershaw stressed the desire of the Britons to live in peace with other nations. He said that Britain had a small territory but was densely populated and would, therefore, suffer more heavily than others in case of war.

John Kershaw said that it was the first visit of the delegation of the committee to the Soviet Union. He expressed the conviction that the exchange of views with Soviet deputies will undoubtedly promote better mutual understanding.

### Final Meeting

LD161906 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 16 Jul 85

["Boris Ponomarev's Speech"--TASS headline]

[Excerpts]

Moscow, July 16 TASS -- The final meeting of the delegation of British members of parliament with members of the commissions for foreign affairs of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet was held today. Addressing the meeting, Boris Ponomarev, head of the Soviet delegation, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Commission for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said this: "The main outcome is that the general concern with the dangerous developments in the world and the awareness that the improvement of Soviet-British relations might promote the easing of tensions, peaceful international cooperation have been easing of tension, peaceful international cooperation have been confirmed. The one conclusion that can be drawn from the debate is the measures to end the arms race, above all that of nuclear arms, should be taken before it is too late. Peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, mutual understanding and cooperation are vitally needed. For in the very days that the meeting is held the arms race continues without stopping for an hour. The fresh example is the decision of the U.S. Congress to appropriate funds for the production of binary chemical weapons. Washington is adopting these horrible weapons for service despite protests of millions of people."

Boris Ponomarev recalled the main Soviet initiatives in the field of disarmament and called on the British parliamentarians to study them carefully and without prejudice, bearing in mind the security interests of both countries and their allies, the security of all.

"Mikhail Gorbachev said on July 6, 1985, in his reply to a message from the Union of Concerned Scientists: 'Strategic stability and trust would, no doubt, be strengthened if the United States agreed together with the USSR in a binding form to reaffirm commitment to the regime of the treaty on the limitation of antiballistic missile systems,



a treaty of unlimited duration. The Soviet Union is not developing attack space weapons or a large-scale ABM system. Just as it is not laying the foundation for such a defense, it strictly adheres to its obligations under the treaty as a whole and in its particular aspects, unswervingly observes the spirit and the letter of that document of paramount importance. We invite the American leadership to join us in that undertaking, renounce the plans of space militarization that are now in the making, plans which would invariably lead to the breakup of that document -- the key link of the entire process of nuclear arms limitation."

Speaking about the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative", Boris Ponomarev pointed its unacceptability to the Soviet Union. He urged the British MP's and the British Parliament to do everything for outer space to be used only for peaceful pursuits rather than become a threat to all living on earth.

The Soviet leadership has declared on more than one occasion, he said further, that it stands for cooperation between the USSR and Britain both to solve pressing international problems and to expand bilateral links. Britain could make a tangible contribution of its own to changing the world situation for the better.

"In its relations with Britain the Soviet Union proceeds from the universally-known principles of peaceful coexistence. Our countries belong to different social systems, but this should not be the basis for hostile pronouncements, confrontation, calls for interference in domestic affairs, which are intolerable in relations between sovereign states. Let our countries (just like the social systems to which they belong) show in practice whose system is better in peaceful competition."

In conclusion the Soviet side expressed the wish that the guests from Great Britain inform their colleagues of the Soviet Union's views on urgent issues of the present day, the will of the Soviet people for peace and its desire to develop Soviet-British relations on a mutually beneficial basis.

"Only such an approach would be responsible and far-sighted. The Soviet Union's line with respect to Great Britain is clear-cut and constructive, and in order to realize all this our country expects the British side to make corresponding steps," Boris Ponomarev said in conclusion.

CSO: 5200/1310



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

IZVESTIYA: U.S. USING TALKS AS 'SMOKESCREEN' FOR SDI

PM171551 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jul 85 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Kuznetsov report under the rubric "At the Geneva Talks":  
"From Words to Deeds"]

[Text] Geneva -- The second round of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons ended 16 July.

This stage of the talks -- including regular plenary sessions several times a week and meetings of groups on space arms, strategic arms, and medium-range nuclear weapons -- started 30 May. It has been agreed to start the next round of talks on 19 September.

As is known, the problem of the arms race in space and the ending of the arms race on earth is considered the key problem in Soviet-American relations and for the whole international community. As was pointed out in the January accord in Geneva between the USSR and the United States, this problem must be discussed and resolved in its natural interconnection and interdependence. The USSR came to the new round of talks in Geneva with the specific proposal of the mutual introduction of a moratorium on creating space weapons and a freeze on nuclear arsenals for the whole period of the talks.

Logically developing this approach, our country unilaterally declared a moratorium in April on the deployment of medium-range missiles and the implementation of other measures in Europe.

As the Soviet side proposed, the establishment of a moratorium could have been used to introduce specific proposals on all the questions under discussion, including the question of the levels to which it might be possible to reduce strategic offensive weapons if nuclear space weapons are banned.

Political observers' circles in Geneva greeted with satisfaction the statement made on behalf of the Soviet leadership that the USSR would not take the first steps with weapons in space and that the United States had agreed with the USSR in binding form to confirm its own commitment to the requirements of unlimited duration of the ABM treaty.

However, the U.S. delegation countered this approach with a stance that patently differs from the January accord and sabotaged the constructive discussion of questions, attempting to secure unilateral advantages and impose an arms race in space. The program for creating space strike weapons, which the current administration is pushing through

so zealously in violation of existing treaties and agreements, is aimed at mounting a nuclear arms race in all directions and is provoking resolute condemnation from the world public.

Every day during the second round the Soviet and American delegations received letters and telegrams from various countries expressing concern at the lack of progress in the talks and condemning the U.S. side's tactics, which are aimed at creating the appearance of activity but consider the talks merely a propaganda tool, a "smokescreen" for implementing "star wars" programs.

Let us leaf through the pages of handwritten letters from schoolchildren, war veterans, and workers and the typed appeals from political and public organizations.

"My father and five brothers never returned from the war," wrote Zamanbay Baydauletovich Ozganbeyev, a secondary school history teacher from Chardara in Kazakhstan. "We must prevent the irremediable -- the destruction of our planet in a nuclear war."

Charles (Dezira), chairman of the International Committee of Sachsenhausen, on behalf of 14 national organizations of former concentration camp inmates, believes that it is most urgent to "adopt decisions leading to the reduction of nuclear arsenals and to help lessen the threat of nuclear war and prevent the militarization of space. We welcome the proposal to introduce a moratorium on deploying medium-range missiles in Europe during the talks," C. (Dezira) said.

From far-off Australia a letter arrived for the Soviet delegation from the "Brunswick Valley for Peace" organization. In it (Dzh. Makle) reported about a resolution adopted wishing success to the talks. The letter expressed alarm that the Reagan administration's persistence in implementing the "star wars" doctrine is not leading to success in the talks but, on the contrary, could lead to their failure and unleash an uncontrollable arms race.

In the replies to these appeals from various world countries, V.P. Karlov, head of the Soviet delegation, said in conversation with an IZVESTIYA correspondent that we stress the positive thrust of the USSR's stance at the Geneva talks and the need to adopt practical decisions preventing the spread of the arms race to space and making it possible to halt it on earth, thereby ensuring the conditions for the radical reduction of nuclear weapons.

Letters, telegrams, appeals, lines of expectation and hope... Will Geneva become the symbol of real disarmament? Will it go down in the history of mankind as the city where a new era without wars or weapons had its beginning? This is what the peoples, the future of our children, and future generations expect and demand.

CSO: 5200/1308

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW: SOVIET 'CONCERN' OVER U.S. STANCE; GORBACHEV CITED

LD291249 Moscow in English to North America 0200 GMT 29 Jun 85

[Text] A great deal of concern has been expressed here in the Soviet Union at the stand by the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks. The United States is dragging its feet at the talks and avoiding the solution of issues which brought the parties to the talks together in the first place. At the same time, the United States presses ahead with its military programs in space, on land, and at sea. These programs are aimed at securing military supremacy.

The approach of the American administration to the issues on the agenda of the Geneva talks calls into question the sincerity of its commitment to the talks. After all, the talks were started with clear-cut and agreed-upon goals in mind. According to the agreement reached by the two countries in January, the talks are to result in agreements on preventing arms race in space and halting the arms race on earth. In an attempt to facilitate progress at the talks, the Soviet Union has proposed that a moratorium be imposed for the entire duration of the talks on both attack space weapons and nuclear weapons of the parties to the talks. The Soviet Union backed these initiatives with important, unilateral moves. It reaffirmed that the Soviet moratorium on the launches into space of antisatellite weapons imposed in 1983 remains in force. The Soviet Union also announced that it is suspending the deployment of its missiles and other retaliatory measures in Europe until November. The Soviet Union also advanced clear-cut proposals for imposing a total ban on all research into space militarization, scrapping all antisatellite weapons held by the USSR and the United States, and making radical cuts of 25 percent and more in the strategic arsenals. As far as medium-range nuclear missiles are concerned, the Soviet Union is prepared to retain in its European zone no more missiles than are held by Britain and France.

Not a single Soviet initiative aimed at preventing an arms race in space or halting the arms race on earth has, however, met with a positive response from the United States. While making pronouncements on their ostensible commitment to progress in Geneva, the American leaders are in fact undermining the talks. Since the talks got underway 3 and 1/2 months ago, the United States has decided on building another batch of MX missiles, deployed 16 more cruise missiles in Belgium, and begun research into attack weapons in space and the testing of space weapons components.

The United States Administration is saying now that all the long-term programs for the development of space weapons and the building up of nuclear first-strike weapons will be carried out. The NATO Council reaffirmed the timetable for the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. Viewed against that background, the administration's pronouncements on its commitments to the talks appear hypocritical. The Reagan administration torpedoed the previous Soviet-American talks in Geneva, having begun the deployment of its medium-range missiles in Europe. By going ahead with the "Star Wars" program and building up its nuclear weapons, it is jeopardizing the current Geneva talks.

In the circumstance, the Soviet Union will have to reappraise the entire situation. As the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev has said, this country cannot afford to allow the talks to be used to divert attention from military preparations whose aim is to give the United States strategic superiority and support American drive for world domination.

CSO: 5200/1308

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA SEES U.S.-EUROPEAN RIFT ON ARMS CONTROL

PM111310 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jul 85 First Edition p 4

[G. Vorontsov article: "Contrary to Vital Interests; West Europe and the Arms Race"]

[Text] Europe, like the whole world, is going through difficult times. The arms race whipped up by aggressive imperialist circles and their desire to wreck military-strategic parity and nudge mankind into a nuclear catastrophe are arousing growing alarm among the peoples. The task of breaking the vicious circle of confrontation, the arms race, is being posed increasingly acutely on the agenda. The Soviet Union and all the socialist community countries demonstrate again and again their sincere interest in easing tension and achieving practical results in the disarmament sphere.

However, clearly neither the United States nor NATO, despite their peace-loving rhetoric, intend to reduce the pace of material preparations for war. The USSR's exceptionally important decision to introduce a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and to halt the implementation of other retaliatory measures in Europe was hurriedly declared "propaganda" by U.S. officials. This hasty reaction was to a considerable extent aimed at Washington's NATO allies. After all, many of them perceived the Soviet initiative with interest and assessed it as a positive step creating a favorable climate for the Geneva talks.

Many facts attest that sentiments in favor of seeking ways of strengthening security via talks are strengthening not only in public opinion but in the ruling circles of the West European states. This is attested by the growth of the misgivings being expressed in Western Europe in connection with the demands of the U.S. "hawks" that observance of the SALT II treaty provisions limiting the arms race be abandoned. Serious concern in this regard was even voiced at the latest NATO council session, held this June in Portugal. Certain disagreements on other questions also arose at the session. Spain refused altogether to sign the concluding document and Denmark and Greece disagreed with one of its most important points concerning the "need" to continue to deploy U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe.

In adopting the "missile decision" in 1979 and starting to implement it in 1983, the United States and NATO pinned on it their hopes of achieving superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Pact as a whole. The West European states' consent to the deployment of the U.S. missiles was, of course, explained not only by Washington's pressure but by the class interest in ensuring "effective opposition" to the socialist countries and by the hope of strengthening the notorious U.S. "nuclear guarantees."

However, it very soon became clear that the plans were diverging from the reality. The USSR's retaliatory measures aimed at neutralizing NATO's "missile decision" clearly

demonstrated the illusoriness of gambling on achieving military superiority. As for the hopes of certain West European politicians of "waterproofing" the so-called U.S. "nuclear umbrella," they also turned out to be built on shaky ground, since the Pentagon's strategy was developed in the light first and foremost of the egoistic interests of U.S. imperialism, to protect U.S. territory as far as possible from a nuclear conflagration by "restricting" it to Europe.

U.S. and NATO officials have devoted many words to creating the impression that "the alliance's strategic unity has been strengthened." However, even an "atlanticist" such as former U.S. Secretary of State H. Kissinger has been forced to admit that, in the main, West Europeans' attitude to the U.S. missiles is that of a "host to an unwelcome guest."

The United States is essentially embarking on a marked amendment to one of the main postulates of NATO strategy, the "indivisibility" of its defense, whereby an attack on the European allies is considered tantamount to an attack on the United States. In fact, the NATO system of "nuclear defense" has, as it were, a tendency to "break down," since the United States does not hide the fact that it would like to limit the conflict to the framework of the Old World. These feelings have become clearer now, in the eighties, under the current U.S. Administration. Evidently, it is to this that the reflections of Admiral (Retired) A. Sanguinetti, former commander of the French Navy in the Mediterranean, refer. "In the present-day economic war, which is increasingly expanding, West Europe is in fact the United States' main competitor... Consequently, its annihilation would be extremely advantageous for U.S. transatlantic interests. Some people in the United States would like a catastrophe to be provoked... and for U.S. territory to be carefully shielded from the conflict."

The belligerent nature of Washington's policy can also be seen in its constant demands to the West European states to step up their participation in NATO's military preparations. Threats against "negligent" partners regularly stream across the Atlantic, even though since 1970, the partners have increased their military spending by 44 percent. In yielding to U.S. pressure the allies are increasingly prisoners of the accelerating arms race. The "Euromissiles" are to be followed by chemical and neutron weapons and other types of arms.

Even the most obedient U.S. partners have repeatedly expressed doubts about the expediency of certain of Washington's initiatives in the arms race sphere. Particular repercussions were evoked recently by the U.S. attempts to stuff space with weapons and involve its allies in the implementation of its so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). The West Europeans received the U.S. "star wars" plans extremely equivocally. Whereas the aggressive and militarist NATO circles expressed their support for the plans, the broad masses of the population spoke out unambiguously against them. The "star wars" program was discussed in a resolution at the 14th Congress of the Union of EEC Socialist Parties in April, in which the heads of government of a number of West European states took part.

Alarm in connection with the prospect of the arms race being transferred to space has been voiced at the most varied levels in all West European states. Thus, R. Dumas, French minister of external relations, stated outright that the SDI "will lead to overarmament, which is what the militarization of space would be, and, consequently, to a stepping up of risk and danger." British Foreign Secretary G. Howe warned of the danger of destabilizing the international situation and stepping up the arms race in the event of pushing ahead with the SDI.

Encountering resistance, Washington resorted for the umpteenth time to tactics of persuasion, pressure, and strong-arming. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger persistently proposed that his NATO colleagues take part in work within the SDI framework. This persistence, bordering on uncerecermonious pressure, and the numerous visits, talks, conferences, and symposiums organized by Washington in order to trumpet the "star wars" concept were meant to make the allies support the United States.

Ruling circles in the West European countries are faced with a complex dilemma. On the one hand there is "Atlantic discipline," and on the other it is sufficiently clear to everyone that the Pentagon's space adventures are incapable of strengthening their security. The ultimatum delivered by Washington this March did not lead to the desired results. Greece, Denmark, and France openly refused to participate in the "star wars" program. Even U.S. allies such as the FRG and Britain, despite their initial support for the U.S. plans, started to have their doubts.

As a result the final communique of the June NATO council session did not even mention the "star wars" program, although its imposition, as U.S. Vice President Bush's recent trip to West Europe confirmed, remains the most important U.S. diplomatic priority in Atlantic affairs.

Equally serious divergences can also be noted in attitudes to the prospects for the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. Whereas among the West Europeans, despite all the differences and nuances in the broad spectrum of political forces, interest in a fruitful dialogue, in real arms limitation and disarmament, and in preventing the militarization of space is growing stronger. The U.S. believes that there should be just one opinion on this subject -- Washington's. Not for nothing did R. Burt, U.S. assistant secretary of state, demand in a letter to the seven participants in the Western European Union, who had gathered to discuss the problems of disarmament and space at their session, that no common approach to arms control be formulated outside the NATO framework.

But "Washington's" opinion is obviously that the talks are fully compatible with a feverish arms buildup. The impression is deepening that in order to suit the military-industrial complex, the U.S. Administration in no way intends to achieve the agreed goals of the talks; ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in space. Hitherto, the U.S. side has not put forward a single serious proposal at Geneva on curtailing the arms race. On the contrary, Washington is taking steps which make such a curtailment impossible. Its "star wars" program and the militarization of space have become a truly blank wall in the way of achieving positive results at Geneva.

The Soviet Union, as has been authoritatively stated by its leadership, simply cannot allow the talks to be used once again as a diversion and as cover for military preparations. M.S. Gorbachev has noted that "if our partners in the Geneva talks continue their line of playing for time at sessions of the delegations, avoiding solving the questions for which they have assembled, and using this time to push ahead with their own military programs in space, on earth, and at sea, we, of course, will have to assess the entire situation afresh."

In West European countries, both in the broadest public circles and in many government offices, people are viewing with mounting concern the stubborn continuation of Washington's militarist course, which is capable of plunging West Europe into nuclear destruction. Naturally, this course is meeting with growing opposition.

Broad public circles on both sides of the Atlantic are advocating increasingly persistently a revival of the detente process, the foundations of whose development were laid 10 years ago at the all-European forum at Helsinki and which opens up the real path to peace and disarmament.



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

ITALIAN GENERAL WRITES IN SOVIET WEEKLY, CRITICIZES U.S. STANCE

PM100911 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 27, Jul 85 pp 10-11

[Former NATO Deputy Supreme Commander in Europe for Nuclear Affairs Nino Pasti article: "What Is the Position of the West?"]

[Text] The joint American-Soviet statement issued after the meeting in Geneva on 7 and 8 January this year says: "The sides agree that the subject of negotiations will be a complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms, both strategic and intermediate-range, with all the questions considered and resolved in their interrelationship." Both sides have agreed that "interrelationship" is the tie that binds the space questions, named first in the statement, with the strategic and intermediate-range nuclear weapons. No final result in any one of the three prongs of the negotiations can be reached disregarding the influence or the connections with the other two prongs. While I will explain later why the interrelationship is an essential feature of the current negotiations, I will stress now that the link of the Geneva statement was not yet dried when the Reagan administration tried to change the government.

President Reagan said on 9 January: "Our objective in these talks will be the reduction of nuclear arms and the strengthening of the strategic stability." Asked whether the "Star Wars" could be "a bargaining chip," he said: "No, no, no," On 31 January the President said: "There should be a better way to strengthen peace and stability, a way to move away from a future that relies so heavily on the prospect of rapid and massive nuclear retaliation and towards greater reliance on defensive system which threatens no one.... The United States is committed to the negotiation of an equal and verifiable agreement which will bring real reduction in the power of nuclear arsenals of both sides."

Robert McFarlane, the president's national security adviser, said at a press conference in London on 9 January: "When the time comes, when one or more of these systems (for the 'Star Wars') demonstrates that it may indeed have a contribution to make to deterrence, we would think it a reasonable matter for discussion, negotiation with our allies, and the Soviet Union."

For the Reagan administration "Star Wars" is "moral" and not negotiable, while the offensive nuclear weapons are "immoral" and must be reduced, As a



consequence of the American position any agreement on the reduction of offensive nuclear weapons must be implemented immediately disregarding any "inter-relationship." Assistant Secretary of Defence for International Security Policy Richard Perle said at a press conference on 16 January: "Our view is that if an agreement can be achieved, to ask the world to wait before reducing strategic forces or before reducing the number of intermediate nuclear forces while the negotiations continue to discuss some other subject, would be an absurd burden on the hope and expectation we all have for these talks. We think that as agreements are reached, they ought to be implemented."

In other words, the United States, changing the terms established earlier, is trying to channel the new Geneva conference into the old strategic and intermediate-range nuclear weapons with the nominal addition of a third "table" on the strategic defence initiative ("Star Wars") with no serious negotiation.

The reason why the United States has agreed to sign the Geneva statement and to change its terms overnight is to confuse and mislead the public opinion and to weaken the peace movements, which, according to Perle, "Had all but dis-integrated,"

The American propaganda is insidiously trying to portray the inevitable negative reaction of the USSR as a position against the reduction of nuclear weapons and convince the world peace movements that against the Soviet opposition to any disarmament the United States has the "moral" obligation to re-arm. The "moral" side of the nuclear weapons is an argument stressed by Reagan in order to win the church opposition to the nuclear weapons. On 6 February, quoting the Bible, he said that "the Scriptures are on our side" as a justification for the considerable increase of the military budget.

In order to avoid misunderstanding it is necessary to make the negotiation record straight. The reason for the present negotiation crisis was the deployment of the Pershing 2 and cruise missiles in Europe. The justification that the new deployment was necessary to balance the Soviet SS-20 missiles holds no ground.

Ronald Forsberg, director of the American Institute for Defence and Disarmament, was even more explicit. During a hearing in the Congress in March 1983 he said: "Pershing 2 was an outgrowth of an army programme. It was just a technological modernization. It was planned for deployment in Europe, independently of any request from Chancellor Schmidt or any deployment of the Soviet SS-20. Similarly, the ground-launch cruise missile was not developed in response to any threat whatsoever. It was a matter of taking advantage of new technologies that developed during the Vietnam period, the miniaturization of the turbo-jet in particular, and the scanning devices. An effort was made to make them as long-range as possible. That turned out to maximize at about 1,500 miles, and then to look for places where they could reach the Soviet Union with a 1,500-mile range. That meant on the ground, on ships and submarines, and on airplanes because they obviously could not reach the Soviet Union from this country. So both the ground-launch cruise and the Pershing 2 were, I believe, well on their way to Europe before the SS-20 was discovered as a rationalization, and were emanating from the United States and not from a

request from Western Europe in their origin.... The SS-20 can be seen as modernization in the sense that the word is commonly used in the United States and in the West. They took a vulnerable unreliable system, they replaced it with one less vulnerable to our preemptive attack.... There was no significant qualitative change in the nuclear threat to Western Europe as between the old missiles and the new ones."

Because of the deployment of the Pershing 2 and cruise missiles in Europe and of the obstinate American refusal to include in the negotiations on the intermediate nuclear forces the French and the British missiles whose range is sufficient to destroy targets inside the Soviet territory, there was no more reason for the USSR to continue the negotiations whose aim was to avoid the cruise and Pershing 2 deployment in Europe without unduly increasing the strategic threat to the Soviet Union.

The Pershing 2 and the cruise missiles deployed in Europe are real strategic weapons. This is particularly true of the Pershing 2's whose flying time is so short that they give the Soviet Union no possibility to deliver a retaliatory strike. On the other hand, the SS-20's are not strategic weapons for the U.S.A. because their range is not sufficient to reach targets inside the U.S. territory.

Because the deployment of the Pershing 2 and cruise missiles in Europe has considerably increased the strategic nuclear threat to the Soviet Union, Moscow could not continue the negotiations on the strategic forces reduction on the strategic forces reduction on the old premises and had to appraise the new situation.

In the stalled situation created by the deployment of the Euromissiles, the Reagan administration is investing an enormous amount of energy in the conventional and nuclear forces. The military programmes for the next few years are nearing the \$2 trillion, with a particular emphasis on the "Star Wars." The aim of the "Star Wars" is twofold: to destroy the Soviet nuclear warheads during their trajectory, before they reach the United States, with new systems of anti-ballistic missiles (ABM), and to destroy the Soviet satellites with new anti-satellite systems (ASAT).

As far as the ABMS are concerned, one need not be an expert on military problems to understand that, even when the ABMS are technically perfect, they have no practical possibility to cope with the many thousand enemy nuclear warheads that can be launched in a very short time. The "Star Wars" must necessarily be preceded by a powerful first strike in order to reduce the surviving enemy retaliatory weapons to a bare minimum. It is a simple question of logic--the "Star Wars" will inevitably lead to an American first strike. In order to make the first strike more and more successful the United States is increasing the accuracy of its strategic nuclear weapons by adding a terminal guidance in their strategic warheads.

Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger wrote in his "Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1985": "Trident 2 missiles, now under development, will provide our submarine force the increased payload and improved accuracy needed to assure effective retaliation against hardened target." This means first-

strike weapons able to destroy enemy missiles in hardened silos. The MX missiles now under construction, the Pershing 2 missiles and, in their own way, the cruise missiles have the payload and the accuracy needed for a first strike.

Such an emphasis has nothing to do with a real desire to decrease the nuclear danger. According to the Yearbook 1984 published by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, "The U.S.A. proposed to deploy 8,000 cruise missiles on bombers, ships and submarines most of them with nuclear warheads." In addition, the United States is building 100 MX with 10 warheads per missile, the Trident 2 submarines with 24 launching tubes per submarine, a new strategic bomber the B 1, and is studying the production of another completely new strategic bomber which could elude the radar detection.

The emphasis on the strategic weapons reduction is a way to reduce the surviving Soviet retaliatory weapons to a number manageable by the "Star Wars." This is the reason why no agreement can be reached on the strategic weapons if the "Star Wars" preparation is continued. The "Star Wars" will require more not less strategic weapons and, probably new types of strategic weapons. The result would be an acceleration of the arms race, an increased instability and an increased nuclear danger. In any case, the "Star Wars" constitutes a violation of the 26 May, 1972, Treaty on Anti-Ballistic Missile systems whose aim was to ensure the possibility of a devastating second strike as a deterrent against a first strike.

Article V of the treaty says: "1) Each party undertakes not to develop, test or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based. 2) Each party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy ABM launchers for launching more than one ABM interceptor missile at a time from each launcher, not to develop, test, or deploy automatic or semiautomatic or other similar systems for rapid reload of ABM launchers."

The "Star Wars" was the aim to develop ABM systems forbidden by the treaty and, even more dangerous, it is a complete break of the spirit of the treaty. Reagan's nuclear policy is no longer based on deterrence as is required by the ABM treaty. It is based on a "war fighting capability" by making the nuclear war winnable. This is the real significance of the "Star Wars." Even if the anti-satellite systems (ASAT) are not covered specifically by any treaty, they constitute an additional step in the change of Reagan's nuclear strategy. In some way the function of the American ASAT is complementary to that of the Pershing 2 deployed in Europe: not to give the Soviet Union the time necessary to launch a substantial second strike.

In conclusion, the deployment of the Pershing 2 and cruise missiles in Europe has opened the Pandora nuclear box. The "Star Wars" has completed the menacing circle. To break this circle it is absolutely necessary to stop the "Star Wars" and withdraw the Pershing 2 and cruise missiles from Europe. Both powers must go back to the situation existing before December 1979 prior to the NATO decision to deploy the Euro-missiles and when Moscow was offering honest, serious negotiations to the NATO nations on the SS-20 missiles.

CSO: 5200/1308

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS REPORTS CONCLUDING SESSIONS OF SECOND ROUND

INF Group 11 July

LD111429 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT 11 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva, 11 Jul (TASS)--The group on nuclear medium range armaments has held here today a meeting within the framework of Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments.

Plenary Meeting 16 July

LD161138 Moscow TASS in English 1120 GMT 16 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva, 16 Jul (TASS)--A plenary meeting has been held here today of the delegation of the USSR and the U.S.A. which completed the second round of the talks on nuclear and space weapons. It has been agreed that the next round of talks will start on 19 September, this year.

CSO: 5200/1308

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET ENVOY, MEDIA VIEW SECOND ROUND RESULTS

Karpov Cites Gorbachev Speech

LD161852 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Jul 85

[Text] In Geneva the second round of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons has ended. This is what the leader of the Soviet delegation at the talks, Viktor Pavlovich Karpov, said in an interview with our correspondent:

[Begin Karpov recording] The USSR delegation is consistently pursuing a line aimed at preventing the arms race in space and at halting it on earth. For the attainment of these ends, the Soviet side has put forward specific proposals, the implementation of which would lead to a radical reduction in nuclear weapons, both strategic and medium-range, and to a strengthening of strategic stability.

We are proposing a full ban on offensive space weapons in space, thereby eliminating the threat to security in general which is being endangered by the American "star wars" program, and preserving space for utilization of peaceful aims in the interest of all mankind.

Such a solution of [word indistinct] space weapons would open the possibility of profound reductions of strategic weapons, starting a chain reaction. The specific level of possible reductions is determined by taking account of how the question of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe is decided, since the deployment there of American first strike missiles is acquiring strategic significance for the USSR. Our proposal also provides for a ban on the creation of new forms and types of strategic weapons, i.e. a halt to the arms race in that area.

On medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, the Soviet side has also proposed a reduction on equal terms to the lowest possible level. The Soviet Union is ready to have in Europe only such a number of medium-range missiles as would be equivalent, if one counts warheads, to similar weapons belonging to U.S. NATO allies, Britain and France. The USSR is also in favor of ridding Europe of nuclear weapons altogether, both medium-range and tactical. It must be said that the United States has not in any way reacted to the unilateral moratorium announced by the Soviet Union in April on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. They reject a moratorium on a bilateral basis. The deployment of American missiles is continuing, and this cannot but provoke legitimate alarm among the Europeans. They are well aware that it was precisely the start of deployment of American missiles in Europe which broke up in 1983 the talks on medium-range nuclear weapons, and sharply aggravated the international situation.

As for the direct results of the round in question, the evaluation of the state of affairs at the talks provided by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his speech in Dnepropetrovsk on 26 June this year is fully applicable. The meetings with the American side following this only confirmed the rightness of that evaluation. There have been no movement at the talks, and this is the fault of the American side. [end recording]

Karpov: No Progress

LD161855 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Jul 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; correspondent V. Polzikov Geneva report]

[Text] The Avenue de la Paix -- Peace Prospect -- is the street on which are situated the Soviet and American missions, which are not far from each other. Commencing 30 May, bilateral meetings have been held between the delegations in turn in the session halls. Journalists reporting on the talks, which are of a confidential nature, have attached a deep political symbolism to the name of the street. The peoples of the USSR and the United States can and must live in peace in the interests of international security and for the sake of a clear sky over the planet.

I will remind you that the Geneva talks are being held on a complex of issues of nuclear and space weapons, as envisaged by the Soviet-American accord of 8 January of this year. Three groups are operating within the general framework of the talks -- on nuclear space weapons; strategic arms; and on medium-range nuclear arms. For obvious reasons, priority significance is being given here to questions of outer space.

[Begin Karpov recording] The USSR delegation is pursuing a line toward preventing an arms race in outer space and ending it on earth. On outer space we propose to fully ban offensive space weapons, and in this way to eliminate the threat to overall security posed by the American "star wars" program, and to reserve outer space for use for peaceful purposes, in the interests of all mankind. With such a solution on space armaments, opportunities would be opened for profound reductions in strategic armaments -- by 25 percent and more.

Our proposals also envisage a ban on the creation of new types and kinds of strategic armaments; that is, an end to the arms race in this field.

On medium-range nuclear armaments in Europe, the Soviet side has also proposed a reduction to equal minimum levels. The USSR is prepared to have in Europe only a quantity of medium-range missiles which would be equivalent -- if you include warheads -- to the same as those of the U.S. NATO allies, Britain and France. The USSR is also in favor of freeing Europe from nuclear armaments altogether, both medium-range and tactical.

It must be said that the United States has not reacted at all to the unilateral moratorium announced by the USSR in April on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. It rejects a moratorium on a bilateral basis. The deployment of American missiles continues, and this cannot fail to give rise to legitimate alarm on the part of the people of Europe. They understand well that it was precisely the beginning of the deployment of American missiles in Europe which, in 1983, broke off the talks on medium-range nuclear armaments and sharply exacerbated the international situation. No progress was made at the talks; this was the fault of the American side. [end recording]



Possible 'Reappraisal' of Talks

PM161543 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 28, Jul 85 p 1

[Editorial: "Blank Wall in Geneva"]

[Text] How is the second round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments coming along? The whole world is waiting for good news from Geneva. But there is no good news. The news is anything but encouraging.

In its report on a meeting between members of the NATO Council and leaders of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, the NOUVELLES ATLANTIQUES, a publication close to the NATO headquarters in Brussels, observed: "The impression given by the American delegation of the negotiating process was very pessimistic." It would seem that official Washington is already beginning to prepare its NATO allies and the public for a no-result end to the second round, and is shifting the blame in advance on the Soviet Union which, you see, flatly refuses to join in Reagan's "strategic defence initiative."

"Reagan's strategic defense initiative," the NOUVELLES ATLANTIQUES said, "appears to have become the main problem dividing the Americans and the Russians in Geneva." That indeed is so. The Soviet Union has given its authoritative appraisal of the situation. "The American programme for the militarization of outer space acts as a blank wall barring the way to relevant agreements in Geneva," Mikhail Gorbachev has stressed. To arrive at agreement it is essential to act in the spirit of the Soviet-American understanding of January 7-8 this year on the subject and aims of the talks, which provided for the problems of preventing the arms race in outer space and of terminating that race on earth to be examined and resolved in their interconnection.

Such was the agreed mandate given the negotiators. It defined not only the subject and purpose of the talks but also the criteria of their success. The White House, however either believes that agreements are binding only to the other side and not on the United States or it has concluded that it made a mistake in agreeing to that mandate.

The U.S. is already retailoring to its own measure the terms of reference agreed with the USSR. Paul Nitze, adviser to both the President and the secretary of state on arms reduction talks, when asked in Western Europe whether he hoped that agreement would be reached with the USSR replied that the U.S. hoped there would be such agreement on offensive nuclear weapons and their substantial reduction in both the quantitative and qualitative respects. This, he said, applied both to long range nuclear weapons classified as strategic and to medium-range weapons such as the SS-20, Pershing 2 and cruise missiles. But he made no mention of space weaponry.

It was not a matter of forgetfulness on the part of the White House and State Department adviser. He is in full possession of his faculties. Like the U.S. delegation in Geneva, he simply scrupulously follows the President's directive: The "star wars" programme is a sacred cow, and if the Russians want to cut something let them cut their own strategic programmes.

The strategem is obvious. While reserving for itself a free hand to develop and deploy space strike systems the U.S. is out to weaken the other side's deterrence and retaliation potential, to paralyze its strategic forces. Embarking on the militarization of outer space and continuing the militarization of Western Europe and its trans-

formation into a first-strike springboard, it counts on being able gradually to disarm the "potential adversary" so as to eventually compel it to show the white flag.

With such an approach to talks and the negotiating partner, the U.S. President, regardless of his reputed "genius for persuasion," will succeed in nothing but getting himself into an embarrassing position and exposing his true intentions.

It is said that the U.S. delegation has been instructed to display flexibility and patience. But where is this flexibility -- it certainly is not manifest in its stubborn refusal to examine and resolve the problem of preventing the militarization of outer space. As for patience, the U.S. negotiators have settled down to wait "until the Russians alter their stand," in other words, make concessions.

However, it is ill-advised to try the patience of others, for it is liable to run out. The architects of the blank wall in Geneva should know that the Soviet Union, remembering the sad experience of the previous talks which Washington torpedoed, cannot, as Mikhail Gorbachev stressed, allow "the talks to be again used as a blind, as a cover for war preparations aimed at ensuring the strategic superiority of the U.S. at world domination." It would be better for all if Washington adopted a more reasonable position and corrected its behavior, so that the USSR should not have to make a reappraisal of the situation both at the talks and around them.

#### TASS: Geneva Results "Unsatisfactory"

LD161403 Moscow TASS in English 1338 GMT 16 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva July 16 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports: The second round of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms, which was under way here since May 30, ended today. The talks are confidential, but all known facts prompt the conclusion that the results of also this round remain unsatisfactory through the fault of the American side.

The Soviet Union has come to Geneva with a firm intention to conduct concrete talks with a view to achieving an end to the arms race on earth and preventing it in outer space. Keen to facilitate the search for mutually acceptable solutions, it has suggested freezing the development, testing and deployment of space strike weapons, strategic offensive arms and medium-range nuclear systems for the entire duration of the talks. Simultaneously, it has unilaterally suspended the deployment of its medium-range missiles in Europe until next November and reaffirmed that all its earlier proposals for limiting armaments and precluding the militarization of outer space hold good.

Over all this time, the American Administration, on the contrary, has been carrying on its persistent efforts to escalate the arms race in practically all areas -- from MX intercontinental ballistic missiles to chemical binary weapons. And White House spokesmen have been stubbornly stressing that the United States is going to forgo the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) program by no means, despite the fact that it may cause another qualitative leap in the arms race, one with most dangerous consequences for peace and international security.

The difference in the two positions is all too obvious. So Washington, eager to cover up the patently negative nature of its policy and to try and allay world-wide public concern about the abnormal state of things at the Geneva negotiations, has been busy enshrouding the whole matter in as much fog as possible. One of the more strik-



ing instances has been a recent NEW YORK TIMES canard about the Soviet Union being prepared to put up with SDI. It was part of the same propaganda campaign that American Senator Sam Nunn has claimed at a news conference in Geneva that if the USSR agrees to certain compromises, it will be treated to some important surprises from the American side. The calculation behind the effort is simple -- to feign a "constructive approach" and to charge afterwards that the hopes have been dashed by the USSR's "lack of flexibility".

Only this smokescreen of empty words and indefinite promises has not helped Washington much. The Geneva-based LA SUISSE observed recently that as compared with the dynamic policy of the USSR, the White House line looks particularly inert and lacking initiative.

All this is seen increasingly distinctly by world public opinion which has followed the course of the talks closely and with unremitting attention. Last May and June alone, there were several international forums in Geneva devoted to efforts to contain the arms race, during which the attending representatives of public, trade union, political and scientific circles were practically unanimous in their denunciation of the "star wars" doctrine and demanded immediate and effective measures to stave off the nuclear danger.

The next round of the talks is to open on September 19. And two months after that, on November 19 and 20, there will be a Soviet-American summit meeting also here, in Geneva, where the problems of nuclear and space arms will undoubtedly hold a prominent place. Political observers are asking if the American side is going in the remaining time to make the necessary changes in its position that would clear the way to movement ahead.

#### Moscow Radio on Geneva, Summit

LD162220 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1624 GMT 16 Jul 85

[From the "International Diary" Program by Igor Surguchev]

[Text] The second round of the Soviet-US talks on nuclear and space weapons ended in Geneva. The talks are of a confidential nature but all the known facts force one to conclude that the results of this round too remain unsatisfactory through the fault of the American side. The Soviet Union is conducting the talks with a view to achieving a halt to the arms race on earth and not allowing it to spread into space. It proposed a freeze on the creation, testing and deployment of space strike weapons, strategic offensive weapons and medium-range nuclear weapons for the whole period of the talks. In unilateral action the USSR halted, until November of this year, the deployment of its medium-range weapons in Europe. In contrast, Washington is stepping up the arms race in all directions and is speeding up the creation of space strike weapons. All this, naturally, does not favor the achieving of mutually acceptable agreements in Geneva. The next round starts 19 September and 2 months after that, also in Geneva the Soviet-American summit meeting, at which problems of space and nuclear weapons will undoubtedly occupy a prominent place, takes place. In this connection the question arises whether the American side in the time that remains intends to introduce the necessary amendments to its position which would open up the way to progress at the talks.

CSO: 5200/1308

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA DENIES ANY CHANGE IN SOVIET POSITION ON SPACE ARMS

PM121539 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jul 85 First Edition p 5

["Unscrupulous Methods" - unsigned "Rejoinder"]

[Text] In Washington rumors are being circulated about the Soviet Union's supposed departure from its position of an unconditional ban on space strike weapons. Certain officials in the U.S. capital, referring to some anonymous conversations conducted by spokesmen of delegations to the talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, are asserting in this connection that the USSR is allegedly no longer insisting on a ban on research work in this field, while others aver that one of the Soviet representatives spoke of this in some other place. Yet others express themselves more ornately: Even if the Russians have said nothing about this, Washington would welcome such an "evolution" in Moscow's position.

All this is no more than the latest unscrupulous method in U.S. propaganda.

The USSR embarked upon the new negotiations with the United States with the firm intention of preventing an arms race in space and curtailing the one on earth. On the key question of the talks -- space arms -- the USSR favors reaching an accord on a total ban on the manufacture, including scientific-research work, testing, and deployment of space strike weapons.

This was and remains the consistent and principled position of the USSR. It fully corresponds to the Soviet-American accord reached in January on the subject and aims of the talks now in progress in Geneva. It is precisely this position, as has been stressed repeatedly in statements by the Soviet leaders, which gives a real opportunity to resolve the problem of limiting and reducing, and, in the final analysis, of completely eliminating nuclear weapons.

But this is just what the U.S. side does not want, as is confirmed both by the behavior of the U.S. delegation in Geneva, and by the practical actions of the U.S. Administration. In order to delude public opinion, myths are being circulated about the Soviet position: First it is said to be hardening, then the opposite is immediately said -- that it is softening. In short, they are engaging in all manner of things except the conduct of serious negotiations.

It is time Washington adopted a more responsible approach to such serious matters.

CSO: 5200/1308

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET PEOPLE APPEAL FOR PROGRESS AT TALKS

LD151301 Moscow TASS in English 1208 GMT 15 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva, 15 Jul (TASS)--TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports;

The Soviet people are following with great attention the course of the Geneva talks between the USSR and the U.S.A. on nuclear and space weapons. This is seen from the stream of letters pouring to Geneva. Thousands of people--whole work collectives of mills and factories, research and educational institutions as well as individual citizens are addressing both participants with expressions of concern about the lack of progress at the talks, are expressing approval of and support for the constructive stand of the Soviet delegation, and urge the U.S. side to display, in its turn, a serious and responsible attitude, to take specific steps for a positive resolution of the problems, which are of vital significance for the entire mankind.

We call upon the U.S. administration, the NATO member-countries to heed the voice of reason, put an end to the arms race, stop the "Star Wars" preparations, ensure the right of the peoples to life," the workers of the tobolsk petrochemical integrated works declare.

The same appeal is contained in the letter from the crew members of the "Anatoliy Bredov" fishing vessel of the Murmansk merchant marine, the inhabitants of Petushki township of Nizhnekolymsk District in the north of Yakutiya, the workers of the "50th anniversary of the October Revolution" cotton production amalgamation in Osh, and many others.

"We totally and fully support the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government, whose supreme goal is preservation of peace all over the world," stress the workers of the mechanical workshop of the Zangezur copper and Molybdenum integrated works.

Recalling that the Soviet Union has unilaterally declared a moratorium till November on the deployment of its medium-range weapons in Europe, a group of the Great Patriotic War Veterans from the City of Lubny in the Poltava Region persistently recommend that the U.S. side should follow suit.

"We demand an end to the "Star Wars" preparations and that success be ensured for the Geneva talks. We wish peace and a happy future for all people on

earth," says the message from the inhabitants of Ostrovets Village of Umansk District in the Cherkassy Region. In January 1944, the German Nazis burnt the whole village to the ground and shot 154 of its inhabitants--old people, women and children.

The war-time experiences have made a group of veterans, who work now at auto-transport plant 12121 in Voroshilovgrad, former nurse Zoya Yetemina from the City of Pavlodar (Kazakh SSR) and war veteran Pyetr Surovtsev from Tyumen take to pen.

The keynote of their letters is the one that is particularly well spelled out in a message from the staff members of the newspaper PO ZAVETAM LENINA (following Lenin's behests) of Ulyanovsk District of the Kaluga Region: "In face of the sacred memory of the fallen we say that we need peace. We will not allow 'Star Wars' to flare up."

CSO: 5200/1308

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET ANALYST STRESSES IMPORTANCE OF ARMS MORATORIUM

LD140148 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 13 Jul 85

[Text] What does the Soviet Union suggest for outer space to remain peaceful forever and to serve the good of all nations? This question is discussed by our news analyst Vladislav Kozyakov. Here is what he writes.

[Kozyakov] Now that the Geneva talks are in progress it is highly important to contribute to their success. For this reason there is a pressing urgency to the Soviet proposal that for the entire duration of the talks a moratorium should be imposed on space and nuclear arms. That means a freeze on the nuclear arsenals on both sides and a stop to the preparations in the development of weapons to be sited in space.

On this basis it is necessary to move over immediately to limiting the stock-piles of arms. This step would be a reasonable and natural measure which might help with action towards the announced goals of the talks, to prevent an arms race in outer space and to stop it on earth. I may remind you that these goals were set for the Geneva talks by an accord between the USSR and the United States reached last January. The Soviet Union still abides by that accord and is steadily acting for its realization in all its parts, that is, as far as prevention of militarization of space is concerned, as well as a reduction in nuclear arsenals.

The key issue now is to bar weapons from space. The Soviet stand on the issue is clear and well defined. The USSR will not move into space with weapons first, said Mikhail Gorbachev recently in his reply to an appeal from the American organization the Union of concerned scientists. We shall make every effort, he said, to convince the other countries, above all the United States, not to take such a fatal [as heard] step which would inevitably increase the menace of nuclear war and would give impetus to a runaway arms race in all directions.

The Soviet Union advocates at the Geneva talks an agreement on a total ban on strike space weapons. That must be a ban on the development of such weapons, including research in the area. It must also be a ban on the testing and deployment of such weapons. In short the Soviet proposals provide for radical solutions which would fully rule out the emergence of arms in space.

This approach is shared by a vast majority of United Nations member-countries. The Soviet proposal in the form of a draft treaty to ban the use of force in space and from space against targets on earth has the support of nearly all the countries of the world. Were the United States to join these efforts too the issue of space arms would be closed once and for all. A highly important aspect of this problem is to set up obstacles to the development of anti-satellite weapons. Again the Soviet Union has set a good example. It introduced as far back as 2 years ago a unilateral moratorium still in effect on placing satellite weapons in space. The moratorium will be in effect all the time the other states act likewise.

The Soviet Union urges the United States to fully stop on a reciprocal basis work in developing new anti-satellite weapons and to destroy those weapons that the Soviet Union and the United States already have, including arms whose tests have not been as yet completed. The problem of preventing militarization of space requires now a farsighted and responsible approach. The Soviet approach to the problem is noted by concern for the good of all nations. The ban the USSR proposes on the development, testing and deployment of strike space systems would make it possible not only to preserve space for peaceful exploration, research and scientific discoveries but also to start the process of sharply reducing and destroying nuclear arms.

CSO: 5200/1308

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET DELEGATE DENIES NEW YORK TIMES REPORT OF SDI COMPROMISE

LD102205 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2111 GMT 10 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva, July 10 (TANJUG) -- The Soviet delegation to the Geneva negotiations today denied THE NEW YORK TIMES reporting that it had notified the U.S. partners that the Soviet Union could, under certain conditions, accept an arms control agreement allowing of research within the "Star Wars" project.

Spokesman for the Soviet delegation Valeriy Artomyev said that "such reports do not reflect the current state of affairs in these negotiations."

The State Department also denied the credibility of the report. Its spokesman, Smalley, said that, except for the earlier Soviet stand that "a research ban cannot be verified", there were no other signs that could give grounds to THE NEW YORK TIMES report.

In spite of these denials, some doubts have remained in the Palais de Nations. The majority of observers have the impression that the report on possible compromises in the domain of space arms research was not categorically denied. The Soviet denial, it is being noted, places emphasis on "the current state of affairs". In view of the pace of the negotiations, this could mean that the denial need not necessarily relate to all the future "states of affairs".

In their statements to date, the two sides took totally opposite stands which were a chief obstacle to any progress in the Geneva negotiations.

CSO: 5200/1308

SPACE ARMS

FURTHER SOVIET COMMENTS ON BUSH SDI EUROPEAN TOUR

Antimissile Demonstrations in Netherlands

LD261747 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 26 Jun 85

[Text] The U.S. Vice President's visit to the Netherlands has been accompanied by antimissile demonstrations. George Bush's talks with Prime Minister Lubbers focussed on the problem of sitting American cruise missiles with nuclear warheads. Honoring the will of the overwhelming majority of the population, the Dutch Government has so far given no consent to the deployment of first strike weapons on Netherlands soil. It is also noted that the Dutch side has responded coolly to Bush's call for joining efforts to put the "Star Wars" project into effect,

'Blackmail' in UK

LD032223 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 3 Jul 85

[Text] The Vice President of the United States, George Bush, is reported to have arrived in London for the last stage of his tour of Western Europe. During his tour, the vice president has not so much negotiated as demanded that America's allies in Europe toe the line. Now what will happen in London. Here's an opinion from Anatoliy Gan:

Whitehall has said on more than one occasion that it believes its special relations with the United States must be backed up in practical ways at any cost. And it has done just that. Suffice it to recall that Britain paved the way for the siting of American cruise missiles in Europe. As a result, the danger of nuclear war breaking out on the European Continent has increased many times over. More recently, Britain has been among the first NATO countries to (?endorse) so-called research into the Reagan Strategic Defense Initiative. What is this, if not paving the way into space for American strike weapons for "Star Wars"?

Vice President Bush has been visiting the West European capitals with the express purpose of crushing opposition to America's plans to transform space into the theater of the most terrible war imaginable. Naturally, Washington pins its hopes on Britain to help crush opposition, knowing that Britain's leaders are prepared to back up their special relations whatever the cost.



Whitehall has clearly confirmed this with its attitude towards the American scheme for combatting terrorism. Significantly, the very first report about Mr Bush's arrival in London said: The Prime Minister had voiced her support for the American decision to isolate the Beirut airport and ban aircraft of the Lebanese airlines from flights to the United States. Immediately, Washington issued an ultimatum to other countries that if they failed to support the boycott, their airlines would lose the right to land planes at American airports. Also, the White House has not ruled out military action against the Lebanese.

What is this? Blackmail or state terrorism? Both, apparently. If Britain opts for the American policy of blackmail and state terrorism that George Bush insists on, it will lose more than it gains.

#### U.S.-European Differences Remain

PM091334 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 85 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Gan "Commentator's Column": "Misfire"]

[Text] U.S. Vice President G. Bush's 10-day tour of West European countries is over. On the president's personal orders, the administration's "Number Two" visited Italy, the FRG, the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, France, and Britain.

Bush's journey was multipurpose. Its main task, however, was formulated by the White House with singular unambiguity: while promoting the odious "Star Wars" program, to try to pacify the anxious Europeans and involve them as far as possible in work on the creation of strike space weapons.

Washington made no secret of the need for such a mission. Its hopes that the allies would at the first command hurriedly block behind the "senior partner" in the implementation of the adventurist scheme proved to have been a pipe-dream. Much to the United States' displeasure, there were widespread suspicions on the European Continent that the transatlantic strategists are trying to fob them off with some unsuitable and dangerous "goods." The NEW YORK TIMES reported that "publicly, and even more so in private, European leaders are voicing growing fears that the administration's program will obstruct progress at the arms control talks with Moscow." Furthermore, people in West European capitals are clearly feeling a justified alarm that the United States, noted for its selfishness, would want in the first place to "bleed dry" its allies technologically by assigning to them the role of some kind of "subcontractors" with regard to ideas and resources. It is difficult to deny the correctness of the journal LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE, which perceives Washington's desire for technological superiority over its partners as just one of the means of ensuring "voluntary-enforced cohesion" under its auspices.

Bush's talks during his trip and his speeches did, in fact, testify to all this. He used hackneyed anti-Soviet fabrications as a kind of "peg" on which

he hung demagogic talk about deliverance from the threat of nuclear war by means of...the militarization of space. None of this, however, caused the "grateful audience" to applaud.

At the final stage of his tour in London, waxing emotional, the vice president launched sharp attacks against those "who avoid fulfilling politically unpopular pledges and who want peace so much that they fail to see the need for the implementation of specific measures." The transatlantic emissary's disappointment was so great that he did not restrain himself from threatening "obstinate allies."

In other words, the results of Bush's West European travels make it possible to draw the conclusion that differences between the United States and its Atlantic partners in their approach toward the "Star Wars" program have not been overcome. Many people in the continent perceive the extreme dangerousness of Washington's course for peace and security much more clearly than the U.S. administration would like.

#### Army Paper Sees Failure

PM091137 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Jul 85 Second Edition p 3

[Captain 2d Rank Ye. Nikitin "Pertinent Remarks": "By Hook or By Crook"]

[Text] The West European tour by U.S. Vice President G. Bush, during which he visited 7 countries, lasted 10 days. The American Vice President had meetings not only with the leaders and other high-ranking officials in those states' administrations but also with representatives of West European firms and corporations specializing chiefly in the fulfillment of military orders. He participated in a NATO Council session at the level of ambassadors-permanent representatives of the North Atlantic bloc member countries. And, finally, before departing across the ocean, he addressed London's International Institute of Strategic Studies.

The chief purpose of the transatlantic emissary's trip was to enlist the West Europeans' support in implementing the program of preparation for "Star Wars." It is known that this program is being resisted by politicians and the public in a number of West European states. And, therefore, as the Brussels newspaper LE SOIR stated, Bush's visit turned "into a series of arm-twisting exercises with the West Europeans."

Putting pressure on the allies and trying to persuade them to participate in the space militarization program, Bush repeatedly spoke of the "flexible stand" taken by the United States on these questions. As the Western press pointed out, the vice president's "flexibility" consisted in an offensive on two fronts at once: at government level and at the level of the private sector. He unambiguously made it clear that the United States certainly does not insist on intergovernmental agreements in this connection, considering "the participation of private firms and concerns in the work perfectly possible," and he demanded that the official authorities not hinder entrepreneurs from

5 August 1985

participating in the development of space weapons. To put it more simply, the transatlantic visitor tried to achieve his aim by hook or by crook.

Nor did the vice president disdain to grossly distort the facts. In particular, at a session of the NATO Consultative Group in Brussels, he groundlessly maintained that the Soviet Union...is violating the terms of its own moratorium on the deployment of new medium-range missiles. The vice president was obviously trying to use these fabrications to justify the continuing buildup of American first-strike weapons in West Europe.

To judge from press reports, the U.S. Vice President's visit has not produced the results expected in Washington. But it has once again exposed the American ruling circles' desire to build up the arms race and shift it into space, involving the West European NATO allies in this dangerous undertaking.

#### European Fears Highlighted

LD121433 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 12 Jul 85

[Text] Washington, 12 Jul (TASS)--TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

Speaking at the National Press Club, U.S. Vice President George Bush claimed that in the course of his recent tour of countries of Western Europe he "found remarkably broad agreement" among the West Europeans on Reagan's so-called "strategic defence initiative," in accordance with which the U.S.A. intends, in violation of the treaty on the limitations of anti-ballistic missile systems, to create a large-scale ABM system with outer space based elements.

Yet the assumed optimism of the statement by George Bush about the alleged support by the West European states for that most dangerous initiative, whose aim, as is known is to ensure for the U.S.A. first nuclear strike capability from behind a "space shield," has been received there with scepticism and irony. It is well-known that not only the public, but also the governments of the allies of the U.S.A. in NATO show apprehension about Washington's "Star Wars" programme. A majority of them have so far not expressed any support for the program, despite the fact that U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger demanded in the form of an ultimatum in March this year that such assurances be made "in the course of sixty days."

The American ultimatum has met with strong protests from the governments of the West European countries. Geoffrey Howe, British Foreign Secretary, described this "initiative" in his statement of 15 March not only as a dangerous, but also as a useless venture, as some kind of a "Maginot Line" in outer space.

Besides, they in Western Europe fear that within the framework of research and development under the "Star Wars" programme, on which the U.S.A. is planning to spend at the first stage 26 billion dollars, the Americans will

make an attempt to "buy over" the leading West European scientists, which would be an irreparable blow to the quality and rate of the scientific technical revolution in Western Europe, which even without that meets with growing competition from the U.S.A. and Japan. These fears were frankly expressed in the latest issue of EUROPE, the Washington-based publication of the European community.

There is a real possibility, EUROPE says, that the "initiative" may prove to be a powerful pump for a braindrain from Europe, while Western Europe will practically in no way benefit from this research and development, as the Americans will highly classify their results. The EUROPE stresses that by force of all these causes, France, for example, has taken a "resolutely negative stand" on Reagan's initiative.

#### Claim of European Support Denied

LD151553 Moscow TASS in English 1418 GMT 15 Jul 85

[Text] Washington, 15 Jul (TASS)--Addressing the National Press Club, U.S. Vice President George Bush was speaking on the results of his tour of Western Europe.

Although George Bush claimed that he had found "broad agreement" among the main allies of the U.S.A. in NATO with the "Star Wars" programme, he failed to cite a single concrete example of support by the West Europeans for that programme. At the same time, he was forced to admit that none of the American partners in NATO had so far expressed readiness to take a practical part in Reagan's so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative." Neither did he deny that a number of questions was put to him in the West European capitals, including whether the new American project would lead to the renunciation of NATO's concepts of deterrence strategy.

Journalists pay attention to the fact that in his explanations the vice president laid the main emphasis on the notorious "Soviet military threat" allegations. He quoted data trumped up by the Pentagon about its scale and urged the NATO member-countries to join in the so-called "defence" plans of the U.S.A.

Yet, as is pointed out in the U.S. press reviews and commentaries, the allies of the U.S.A. in NATO as before shun Reagan's Strategic Defence Initiative, in spite of the crude pressure of the U.S. administration, including economic blackmail. It is stressed that the objections of the Western powers are caused above all by foreign policy and military considerations, in particular, the fears that as a result of the implementation of U.S. "Star Wars" plans, Europe's military vulnerability will increase. Japan, as observers point out, holds a stand similar to that of the European countries.

CSO: 5200/1061

SPACE ARMS

SOVIET JUNE-JULY COMMENTARIES ASSAILING SDI

U.S. Seeks ABM Revision

LD252349 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 25 Jun 85

[Commentary by Vladimir Teplov]

[Excerpts] During the recent flight of the American spaceship "Discovery," the crew conducted an experiment related to the developments of laser space arms. Our news analyst, Vladimir Teplov, comments on the test carried out under the Star Wars program:

The head of the program, Lieutenant General James Abrahamson, has called the experiment an important step in a series of tests of use laser beams in the space armaments developed in the United States. This was no longer theoretical study in the framework of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan. It was an important practical step directed at implementing the program known as Star Wars.

Meanwhile, the Soviet-American treaty on limiting antiballistic missile systems, signed for an unlimited period of time and ratified by both sides in 1972, definitely bans such arms tests. The fifth article of the treaty says that the sides, that is the USSR and the United States, pledge not to develop, deploy, or test systems or components of space-based antimissile defense. The steps of the United States to develop a large-scale, partially space-based antimissile defense system run counter to the letter and spirit of the treaty. That is why lately Washington has been trying to prepare the public for the revision of the document, or for the renunciation of the document to be more exact. Members of the administration are looking for various loopholes in the text of the treaty to undermine it.

The special adviser of the President on the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments, Paul Nitze, in a speech at the School for International Studies at the Johns Hopkins University, said the 14th article of the treaty provides for the possibility of amending it. He made it clear that Washington wanted amendments that would permit the development of partially space-based antimissile defense systems. With such amendments, the 1972 treaty would change cardinally. It would no longer deal with the limitation of antimissile

armaments, but regulate their build-up. In other words, speaking of the possibility of amending the treaty, members of the United States Administration would clearly want to legally sanction a new round of the arms race, this time in outer space.

#### Defensive Purposes 'Fraud'

LD051540 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 5 Jul 85

[Text] We follow with notes by Spartak Beglov, political observer of the NOVOSTI Press Agency.

The nationwide campaigns for nuclear disarmament now taking place in the United States, Britain, and a number of other countries show that broad circles of the world public have managed to see the true objectives of the double game official Washington is playing around the vital issues of war and peace. As the true focus underlying the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative comes to light, the talk of United States' leaders that militarization of outer space is almost the only effective way of doing away with nuclear weapons sounds less and less convincing. There is no better means of ridding the world of nuclear weapons than putting a new weapon in orbit, officials in Washington say. Facts, however, show that this fraud consists of two parts, so to say.

First, the United States is not going to renounce not only nuclear weapons it already has, but its long-term programs for the manufacture and deployment of still more sophisticated types of nuclear weapons, the Pentagon plans to double the number of strategic nuclear warheads within 10 years: In other words, American politicians and generals intend to enter the 21st century with a nuclear arsenal which will be still bigger and more difficult to verify than the one they have today. How, in the light of these facts, can anyone speak about a serious attitude of the American side to the hopes people are placing on the talks in Geneva?

Secondly, as it becomes more and more obvious, the program of "star wars" itself does not at all rule out the use of nuclear devices as components of a strike weapon assigned for deployment in orbit. [sentence as heard] For example, the secret directive 172 of the United States National Security Council, details of which have leaked into the press, directed points to the promising concept of using a nuclear blast to destroy ballistic missiles. This side of the matter has been revealed quite cynically by the father of the hydrogen bomb, United States Professor Edward Teller. Speaking at a recent symposium in Paris, Mr Teller made it clear that the fairy tale about non-nuclear aims of the Strategic Defense Initiative had been invented to deal a blow at the antiwar movement and make it put up with this program.

Broad circles of the public in the West understand this better and better. When British organizations opposint the transfer of the arms race into outer space, including a large group of prominent scientists, handed a letter to the United States Vice President George Bush, protesting against the idea



of "Star Wars," they acted on behalf of those who feel alarmed and who insist that outer space, which is a common possession of nations, and with it peace on earth, be protected against war.

### ABM Treaty, SDI 'Mutually Exclusive'

LD101723 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 10 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow, 10 Jul (TASS) -- TASS observer Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The U.S. Administration continues its course toward destroying the treaty system between the United States and the USSR, including the 1972 ABM treaty, created as a result of lengthy talks to slow down the nuclear and space weapons race. Speaking to journalists on Tuesday, Speakes, deputy White House press secretary, maintained that allegedly the research and work the United States is conducting to create new types of weapons in the framework of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), that is according to the "star wars" program, are allowed by the 1972 treaty on the limitation of the antimissile defense systems. Such a misinterpretation of the Soviet-U.S. treaty obviously follows the aim to distort the basic aims of the joint agreements, and emasculate its very point, which is to serve as a barrier on the path toward creating and developing new anti-missile systems.

Assurances are constantly being heard in Washington that at the present stage of the SDI, only abstract research, "scientific work" is being done, and that no one is banned from doing such research. True, but for what purpose? After all, what is being investigated is not, say, oyster-breeding in space, but the development and design of concrete prototypes of space strike weapons. Consequently, it is a question of a single inseparable complex of projects for the purpose of using space for military ends and securing for the United States military superiority and the potential for a nuclear first strike guaranteed against retribution.

That is why at the Geneva talks the Soviet Union has clearly told the U.S. side that without an accord on the banning of the development -- including scientific work -- of space strike weapons, there can be no accord on reducing nuclear arms.

On the other hand, given a mutual renunciation of the militarization of space -- and Reagan's "star wars" program, with all its scientific research, is precisely a program of militarizing space near the earth and beyond -- the Soviet Union is willing to agree to a radical reduction of strategic offensive armaments and medium-range nuclear weapons.

The 1972 antimissile defense treaty limits and narrows the base of antimissile systems, both quantitatively and geographically. Moreover, it specifically bans the development, testing -- which is just what the United States is now doing -- and deployment of space-based antimissile systems or components.

The authors of the U.S. "star wars" program, in developing their antimissile system, have been acting as if neither the antimissile defense treaty, nor the other bans on military use of space exist. Washington's efforts to combine the antimissile defense treaty and the "star wars" program are an attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable and joint together two things that are mutually exclusive.



'Aggressive Nature' Seen

PM111343 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jul 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Melor Sturua "Rejoinder": "Evidence at First Hand"]

[Text] It is daily becoming increasingly clear how dangerous for mankind the results of extending the arms race to space and turning space into an arena of military rivalry would be. This circumstance was stressed again very clearly in M.S. Gorbachev's reply to the appeal by the "Union of Concerned Scientists" -- a U.S. public organization uniting several hundred prominent scientists who are members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences.

The creation, testing, and deployment of offensive space systems envisaged by the U.S. "star wars" project would undoubtedly be a fatal step which would inevitably increase the threat of nuclear war and provide a stimulus for an uncontrolled arms race in all directions. The fact that the program for the militarization of space has been dubbed the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) by its proponents can delude nobody. It is essentially a question of not a defensive but an offensive and, what is more, an aggressive initiative.

I will not repeat the numerous convincing arguments that attest to the aggressive nature of SDI. I will limit myself just to one, which for some reason has escaped public attention. But first some preliminary observations. As is known, painting the allegedly humane nature of SDI in every way, official U.S. propaganda asserts that its implementation replaces the "cynical" concept of nuclear deterrence with the "noble" concept of an impregnable shield. And there is more to come. It seems that this "impregnability" will make nuclear weapons useless, will provide a stimulus for them to "wither away," and will lead ultimately to universal disarmament.

The critics of such a scheme reasonably object that the achievement of an absolutely impregnable space shield is a chimera and is something from the sphere of fantasy rather than scientific and technical reality. At the first stage -- the traveling salesmen of "star wars" reluctantly agree -- we will reach this goal, they say, in about 20-30 years -- 50 years at the outside. And in the meantime, the skeptics ask? In the meantime, the official doctrine goes, a mixture of "nuclear deterrence" and SDI will operate, and the former will increasingly "wither away," making way for the latter.

Is this how it will really be? Of course not. Such a hybrid will lead not to the withering away but to the further fueling of the nuclear arms race. As one very well informed person said, "if you combine them (defensive systems -- M.S.) with offensive systems, they can be regarded as promoting an aggressive policy."

This conclusion is 100-percent correct, and it is completely confirmed by the practice and example of the United States. While starting to implement the "star wars" program, Washington is at the same time forcing the creation, production, and deployment of first-strike offensive weapons. These include the new MX ICBM, Midgetman, Pershing II, long-range GLCM, B-1B strategic bombers, Stealth aircraft, and Trident II SLBM's. Incidentally, the U.S. House of Representatives has allocated more than one-half billion dollars for the production of the latest submarine-launched D-5 missiles for that class of submarine. According to Pentagon plans, it is proposed to bring into operation a total of 24 Trident-class submarines, each of which will carry 24 missiles.

I note parenthetically that the United States already has 36 nuclear submarines, each with a greater firepower than that used by mankind throughout its previous existence.

Finally, we must not disregard such barbarous weapons as chemical and bacteriological weapons. Their production is also being forced on by the Pentagon while "waiting for" the creation of an impregnable space shield.

Indeed, the author of the aforementioned quotation is absolutely right. The combination of the deployment of defensive systems, which moreover lead to violation of the ABM treaty which is a key element of the whole process of limiting nuclear arms, with the buildup of offensive first-strike systems can only be regarded as the implementation of an aggressive policy. It remains only to add that the author of this quotation is President Reagan. We took it from his famous speech of 23 March 1983. Yes, indeed, the same speech in which he publicly expounded the "star wars" program for the first time!

### Reagan Said Shifting Excuse

LD151619 Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT 15 Jul 85

["'Shifted Accents' in 'Star Wars' Advertising" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 15 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev.

The White House, in a weekly radio address to Americans, loudly reiterated its "right" to develop strike space arms at a high pace. Recalling his statement of March 23, 1983, officially proclaiming the "star wars" concept, the White House chief arrogantly declared that he offered the scientific community a chance to alter the course of history. At the end of his radio address, Ronald Reagan dropped flowery rhetoric and bluntly "justified" Washington's intentions to spiral an arms race in outer space by alleging that it would be the most foolish thing not to do that.

A comparison between the President's March statement and his Saturday radio address reveals a radical shift of accents in "star wars" advertising. The former proclaims the "aim" of making nuclear weapons "impotent" and "obsolete". The latter does not even mention that. It turns out that the aim is to counterpose U.S. own measures to Soviet threats and strategic challenges. Why did the President forget what he said in the past? In all likelihood he realized that tales of this sort would convince no one. Something else is required. The more so at present, when it is necessary to push through Congress huge allocations for the production and development of six new offensive nuclear systems simultaneously. This does not correspond to the slogan of making nuclear offensive weapons "obsolete" and "impotent".

Besides, it is known that directive 172 of the National Security Council, signed by the President, provides for research into options of energy generation by nuclear explosions within the "star wars" project. A joint document, issued by the Defense Department and the Energy Department of the United States in February this year, "legalizes" joint research into new types of nuclear weapons, also within the "Strategic Defense Initiative".

What blustering hypocrisy on the part of the White House to claim that the Soviet Union failed to agree since 1972 to cuts in offensive strategic armaments, that the Russians continued the race for superiority. Was it not the United States which refused to ratify the Salt-2 treaty and discarded a relevant protocol that would have restricted, if not banned altogether, long-range cruise missiles? Was it not Washington which embarked on the path of the gradual withdrawal from the Salt-2 treaty, on the path of discarding its restrictions? Is it not the United States which plans shortly, despite

ABM treaty provisions, to conduct large-scale testing of components of strike space arms and is already field-testing some of their elements?

Of course, the President failed to mention even in passing the USSR's proposals for freezing the sides' nuclear arsenals, ending the preparations for the development of weapons to be deployed in outer space and starting immediately on this basis reductions of armaments already accumulated. He did not mention the practical goodwill steps taken by the Soviet Union which way back in 1982 adopted a unilateral pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, in 1983 a unilateral moratorium on the first launch of anti-satellite weapons and this year introduced a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles and suspended the implementation of other counter-measures in Europe.

The true objective of the plans and actions by the present administration is to attain strategic superiority with the help of the so-called programme of "rearming America" and developing a new type of armaments -- strike space weapons. This objective will not be concealed by any verbal exercises nor "shifts of accents". This is becoming ever more obvious to the entire world.

#### Weinberger Comments Ridiculed

PM171321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jul First Edition p 5

[A. Zagorskiy "Rejoinder"]

[Text] U.S. journalists have somehow noticed that C. Weinberger is more like a military-industrial complex salesman than a defense secretary. Since this is the case, it is not surprising that he is consumed with envy of the reputation of U.S. advertising wizards who, it is said, can sell anybody anything.

A few days ago the Pentagon chief again decided to test his strength against them. On the pages of the LOS ANGELES TIMES he began to extol in all manner of ways the administration's main "ware," the "star wars" plans. It is to be assumed that Weinberger knows that this "ware" is not wanted, that it is rejected by many people both in America and far beyond its borders. But of what concern is this to the Pentatgon, dreaming about acquiring a "shield" to inflict a nuclear first strike?

Weinberger was quite unstinting with epithets, describing the most dangerous plans as "a sensible means to ensure security," as an "insurance policy," and even... "a highly moral, creative task." But no, the Pentagon chief was not succeeding very well. And this is understandable. Who will take on trust his attempts to present the transatlantic military-industrial complex as some kind of "peace champion"?

CSO: 5200/1061

SPACE ARMS

SOVIET JUNE-JULY COMMENTS ON EUROPEAN RESPONSE TO SDI

U.S. Treats Allies as Children

LD300112 Moscow in French to France and Belgium 1930 GMT 29 Jun 85

[Text] The Notes of a Publicist. Boris Tumanov at the microphone:

Dear listeners, good evening. The official propaganda of the American Administration is endeavoring to pass off the United States program for the militarization of space as a series of harmless experiments designed, allegedly, to merely satisfy the purely academic curiosity of President Reagan as to the new defensive concepts. Why, it is a long-term job. No one knows yet what results it may give. And, all in all, there is nothing to make such a fuss about since nothing has been decided yet.

Such is the official position designed to serve for propaganda purposes. It tends not only to lull the vigilance and the anxieties of international opinion but also to insinuate that the firm position of the USSR on the problem of the militarization of space is premature and testifies to its bad faith.

All this is complete nonsense. The American Administration has already blown the starting whistle in the space arms race and does not conceal in any way that it considers "Star Wars" as an accomplished fact.

General Abrahams, chairman of the Military Space Programs Committee, which is called "high frontiers," regularly appears on American television screens surrounded by children to whom like a kindly grandfather, he tells stories about the good lasers and other sophisticated gadgets which will protect the United States from the missiles of the nasty Russians.

I have the impression that Washington is treating the external world, especially the European allies, as children. At any rate this was my impression when I perused the documents of the colloquium recently organized in France on the subject: SDI--Europe and France. An eloquent fact, let us say it in passing, the initiative of this colloquium belongs to the Front of the Future, a French organization headed by Monsieur Jacques Delong, a rally for the Republic deputy. I shall come back to this a little later.

The participants at the colloquium therefore assembled to hear in particular the American professor, Edward Teller, known as father of the hydrogen bomb, but especially for his primary anti-communism which drives him so far as to rehabilitate nuclear war.

Professor Teller laid his cards on the table. He admitted straightaway that the American official position alleging that it would be possible to create an absolutely watertight space shield was only a myth. It is also he who asserted that the American space militarization program would not lead to the abolition of nuclear missiles. We must underline at once that Mr Teller expressed these views at a moment when American propaganda is bending over backwards to persuade public opinion that the "Star Wars" program represents a beneficial alternative to nuclear armaments.

Even better, the American professor demanded the complicity of the governments of Western Europe in order to make the militarization of space irreversible. It is necessary, he said, within the next 4 years to attain even partial results in order to compel President Reagan's successor to pursue this program. He stressed next that the participation of West European companies in the program was not sufficient and that it was necessary to raise this cooperation to government level.

Professor Teller says out loud what the American leaders think but do not say openly for fear of definitely scaring off the countries of Western Europe.

If one carefully analysed Teller's remarks, one would inevitably reach the conclusion that the United States intends to turn the West European governments, whatever they may be in any case in the post-Reagan era, into hostages of Washington's present policy. And this despite the visible reticences and reluctance which certain European NATO member-states have displayed in regard to the "Star Wars" concept.

It comes to me that this resistance on the part of Western Europe to the American space militarization project is not yet strong enough and determined enough to discourage Washington. And the White House has not lost hope of [word indistinct] in the West European capitals' attentive ears and, why not, accommodating ears.

Of course, one must not feel surprised when the representatives of the French right provide a platform for Mr. Teller to enable him to advertise "Star Wars." But, one remains perplexed at the attitude of certain French official figures who, while in principle condemning the militarization of space, have given the green light to French companies to participate in the Pentagon's space programs. Is it possible that they too believe in the tales of grandfather Abrahams?

### Kohl Remarks Contradictory

PM101330 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jul 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Finding Something To Boast About"]

[Text] Brussels, 9 Jul -- FRG Chancellor H. Kohl has used the 30th anniversary of West Germany's entry into the aggressive NATO military-political bloc to come out once again in support of the U.S. plans for the militarization of space. In an article devoted to this date featured in NATO REVIEW, a journal published by NATO headquarters, he argues for the continuing implementation of the "star wars" program developed by the U.S. Administration, claiming contrary to logic that it is "defensive" and even... entirely compatible with the ABM treaty between the USSR and the United States. The chancellor also boasts that the FRG has played and continues to play the main role after the United States in the deployment of the U.S. first-strike Pershing-2 nuclear missile weapons and cruise missiles.

The article stresses that the Bundeswehr is the cornerstone of the West's military might in central Europe. "The FRG's contribution," H. Kohl writes, "is of immense importance for NATO. The FRG has doubled bloc forces in Europe." He points out that West German Armed Forces today comprise one-half of NATO ground forces in central Europe, one-third of the bloc's air forces, 70 percent of its naval forces in the Baltic, and all of the NATO naval aviation in that region. The FRG Government, the article notes, will continue to promote the buildup of NATO's arsenals of "conventional" arms. West Germany has borne the brunt of the expenditure on the program to expand and modernize the bloc's military infrastructure and a significant amount of the expenditure to maintain the AWACS airborne radar aircraft which conduct reconnaissance in the socialist countries' border zones. The chancellor also stresses that no other Western country bears such great costs as the FRG for holding NATO military maneuvers on its territory.

The chancellor stated Bonn's desire to "improve East-West relations" and the FRG's interest in the success of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva. But, he immediately contradicts himself when he argues for a virtual rejection of the previously defined goals of the Geneva talks and for the "legitimization" of the U.S. plans for the militarization of space, in which, as is clear from the article, the FRG intends to participate.

### FRG Defense Minister Hit

LD081922 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 8 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow, 8 Jul (TASS)--TASS commentator Lev Aksenov writes:

FRG Defense Minister Manfred Woerner has described the U.S. "Star Wars" programme as 'morally' legitimate and politically indispensable," the DPA agency said. Speaking in an interview with the DEUTSCHLAND-MAGAZIN, he pointed out that the nuclear deterrence strategy adopted by the North Atlantic bloc now "serves the interests of peace."

The head of the West German military department, who has already gained the reputation of one of the most zealous advocates of the plans to militarise



outer space, admitted in his interview that the current NATO strategy, by which the leaders of the bloc "substantiate the need" for the nuclear weapons race, "will be necessary at least during the coming decade, and, possibly, subsequently." He thus made it clear that the NATO bloc will build up the war hysteria and carry on the gigantic arms race also in the third millenium.

The statement by the West German minister in the interview is proof of the fact that the FRG's ruling circles, which are taking the lead in their policy from the Washington Administration, stubbornly refuse to heed the mounting protests of political and public figures, trade union leaders and prominent scientists against the implementation of the "Star Wars" programme. The press reported the other day that 350 prominent West German scientists addressed a letter to Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl declaring their refusal to participate in a militarisation of outer space.

Yet, the leaders of the ruling coalition in Bonn continue claiming to this day that almost the most "useful" aspect in the FRG's participation in the material preparations for the "Star Wars" will be the technological gain. But competent experts say with good reason that these dangerous projects may lead only to a growth of the threat to universal peace.

The apologists of "Star Wars" ever more often distort facts and have recourse to misinformation in face of powerful opposition to the militaristic plans. In doing so, they at times let out what the NATO leaders preferred to pass over in silence to this time. The continuation of the nuclear weapons race in the next millenium as promised by Defense Minister Woerner is graphic evidence of that.

#### Brandt on INF, SDI

Ld221513 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 22 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn, 22 Jun (TASS)--If the Social Democrats win at the 1987 elections to the West German Bundestag, they will do everything to have nuclear missiles removed from the territory of the FRG through talks, and to avert the danger of "Star Wars." This has been stated by Willy Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party (SPD), who spoke in Bremen today at a Congress of the Land Organization of the SPD. The Social Democrats, he said, should consistently work for peace, detente and disarmament. Willy Brandt strongly condemned the policy being pursued by the Kohl-Genscher Conservative Government, the offensive on the social gains of the FRG's working people and the infringement of their rights.

According to Brandt, the SPD policy enjoys growing support among the electorate. This is evidence, he stated, by the Social Democrats' successes at this year's elections to the landtags of North Rhine-Westphalia and Saar.



### Opposition Grows

OW050739 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 4 Jul 85

[From the NOVOSTI newscast, commentary by Boris Parkhomenko]

[Text] A wave of opposition to U.S. plans to militarize space is growing in Western European countries. Our commentary:

[Parkhomenko] Hello, comrades. The so-called SDI, fostered by the ringleaders of the Pentagon and the U.S. military-industrial complex, was, from the outset, a reason for sharp polarization of opinion in the political and social circles of Europe. Lauded to the skies by militarist forces, primarily pro-NATO politicians, and weapons' and contemporary technology manufacturers, this so-called initiative has provoked scepticism and apprehension among far-sighted politicians, and deep indignation from public circles.

Just look at who has defended and advocated the program for the militarization of space--the President and the vice president, the U.S. Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State, NATO generals and admirals. Even Professor Edward Teller, the American scholar and nuclear physicist, and father of the hydrogen bomb, added his voice to the general chorus of advocates for "Star Wars."

Let us remind you that, once before, he had spoken in defense of another initiative. He was one of the most ardent supporters of a demonstrative U.S. atomic strike on Japan in 1945. Speaking to reporters in Paris, Teller said that the creation of a reliable NATO space shield is the work of many decades, and that is why the Europeans should commit themselves to its creation now, so as not to lose time in the future.

However, the demarche of the militaristic scholar did not stimulate action. A joint letter to Chancellor Kohl from 350 West German scientists of the Max Planck Institute in Munich, in which they announced their refusal to participate in research work in the framework of the notorious initiative, was almost a direct response to this. Many scientists participating in the Eureka Project, which foresees the cooperation of specialists from practically all European countries in the sphere of the creation of the latest technology, evaluated Teller's invitation as an attempt to draw Europe into the orbit of U.S. militaristic plans. Expert opinion of scientists most accurately reflects the negative attitude of the Western European public to the U.S. program for the militarization of space.

### UK Article on Subcontracting Cited

LD121744 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT 12 Jul 85

[Text] London July 12 TASS -- Apprehension, irritation and duplicity of West Europeans in the approach to the "star wars" programme are well justified, writes in the British "NEW STATESMEN" former deputy head of the U.S. delegation to the Soviet-American negotiation on limitation and reduction of strategic armaments in Geneva Jack Mendelson.

Washington is trying to "buy" West Europeans with promises of all sorts of benefits — scientific-technical, economic and financial, should they join the programme. In this connection the author points to the negative opinion in the question of West German and also British specialists who believe that the United States intends to use West European countries as contractors.

The United States would be in a better position, if Western Europe was not tempted by 30 silver pieces of subcontracts and supported those who seek to drive the "star wars" gin back into the bottle, Mendelson writes in conclusion.

### Japanese-French Differences

LD161100 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 16 Jul 85

Text] Paris July 16 TASS -- Summing up at a press conference here the results of his talks with President Francois Mitterrand and other French leaders, the Prime Minister of Japan Yasuhiro Nakasone admitted the existence of serious differences between the two countries. In Paris, the first stop of his West European tour, Nakasone appeared in the role of an advocate of the American plans to militarise space. The French side, however, reiterated its rejection of Washington's notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative". In respect of military questions and the "star wars" programme I felt that the viewpoints of Japan and France differ, Nakasone told the press conference.

As reported by the press, during the talks Mitterrand had also voiced doubts about the expediency of holding the next meeting of the heads of state and government of the seven biggest capitalist countries, scheduled for next year in Tokyo. Because of the excessive "protocol and bureaucratic nature" of these meetings, he stressed, France sees no point in taking part in them if the method of holding them is not changed.

Questions of bilateral trade and economic relations occupied an important place in the Franco-Japanese talks. As it is noted by the French press, Nakasone's meeting with the French Minister of Industrial Reconstruction and Foreign Trade Edith Cresson ended without result.

CSO; 5200/1061

SPACE ARMS

TASS REPORTS PARIS CONFERENCE ON EUREKA PROJECT

LD171101 Moscow TASS in English 1043 GMT 17 Jul 85

[Text] Paris July 17 TASS - TASS correspondent Yuriy Lopatin reports:

A meeting has opened here today to discuss the French "Eureka" project aimed at outlining a joint policy for the West European states and developing close cooperation between them in the field of advanced technology. This meeting is being held in conformity with the decisions of the Milan session of the European Council of Communities. Attending the meeting are ministers for foreign affairs and research from ten Common Market countries, Spain, Portugal, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Switzerland and Finland, as well as representatives of the commission of the European communities.

They are to decide upon the organisational structure and principles of activities of "technological Europe", as the local press described this programme, outline specific trends and endorse subjects for scientific and technological projects and reach agreement on the sources of funding them. France has tabled, as a basis for discussion, a lengthy document prepared by the centre for the study of advanced systems and technologies enumerating 24 specific programmes and naming the firms of various West European countries, whose co-operation, in the opinion of the authors of the report, may best contribute towards their implementation.

The French mass media point out that "Eureka" was put forward in answer to the "star wars" programme, which is being forced by the United States on its European allies, and which France has resolutely rejected. Officials in Paris say that "Eureka" proclaims peaceful aims, yet, as the newspaper LE MONDE says, one cannot help seeing certain parallels between these two projects aimed at developing practically the same sectors of technology.

CSO: 5200/1061

SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA EXAMINES JAPANESE ATTITUDE TO SDI PARTICIPATION

PM100850 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul First Edition p 4

[Y. Dalnev article: "Tokyo's Tactics and Washington's 'Defense' Strategy"]

[Text] The U.S. Administration is showing increasing persistence in involving its allies in the implementation of the Washington Administration's plan for creating space weapons. Japan is one of the targets of the U.S. demands.

At the end of March, the Japanese Government received a message from U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger containing an official proposal for Japan to participate in studies on the "star wars" program, which is called "Strategic Defense Initiative" in Washington. The Pentagon obviously thought that by harnessing one of its closest partners to the plans for the militarization of space it would be possible to some extent to facilitate the resolution of the task of creating space strike arms, using for this purpose Japan's great achievements in the sphere of the latest technology and the research and development work being actively conducted in the country, including that of a military nature.

The 60-day period for replying to the aforesaid "invitation" stipulated in the message from the head of the U.S. military department has elapsed. Japanese leaders are saying in this connection that the question is "frozen" at the "study" stage and Tokyo's final line will be determined sometime later, "as information emerges" on the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative." Sometime later. . . But why then is the progressive Japanese public sounding the alarm, why are people in the country talking of the real threat of Japan's direct involvement in the practical efforts of those who are working toward cranking up the arms race to a qualitatively new level that is considerably more dangerous for mankind?

Here too, the problem arises of the correlation of words and deeds in Tokyo's policy, of the Japanese Government's tactical course in connection with the U.S. "Presidential Initiative" and its genuine approach to the plans of the transatlantic strategists, who are pursuing by no means "defensive" goals.

The Japanese leadership leaned toward supporting Washington's adventurist "initiative" back in January of this year during the Japanese-U.S. summit in Los Angeles. In talks with the U.S. President, the Japanese prime minister wasted no time in expressing "understanding" with regard to the "star wars" plans, including the creation of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements. This position on the part of the head of government caused an outburst of indignation in Japan, where during debates in parliament officials had to work hard to "elucidate" the premier's statement and explain

his semantic differentiation between the words "understanding" and "support," references to the shortage of information on the U.S. "initiative," and so forth. And at the same time propaganda theses which cause skeptical smirks even in the United States were circulated concerning "purely defensive" nature of the concept of an unpunished first nuclear strike and the fact that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" pursues the goal of making ICBM's "useless" and is aimed at nothing other than "eliminating nuclear weapons." In the words of Japanese Premier Y. Nakasone, it is a question of an "interesting" and "promising" idea. But if so, it could seemingly be more actively supported, except that it is necessary to "study" it thoroughly and take into account the possible line of the U.S. Nato allies, whose reaction to the U.S. plans has by no means been rapturous.

And the "study" phase got fully under way with the involvement of the country's leading specialists. A headquarters for examining various aspects of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" was created in Tokyo, comprising representatives of the Japan Defense Agency, the Foreign Ministry, the Science and Technology Agency, and other official institutions.

A subunit for collating the relevant information was organized at the Japanese Foreign Ministry. The Japanese military departments, according to press reports, also initiated their own "research." In April, a group of Pentagon experts visited Japan at the government's invitation and held a number of conferences to brief the Japanese side on technical aspects of the "star wars" program, focusing attention, needless to say, on the "advantages" of participation in the creation of space strike arms. For their part, Japanese Government representatives constantly alluded to the possibility of joining in the so-called "research studies" being conducted in the United States within the framework of the "Strategic Defense Initiative," although they stressed the importance of a "balanced approach" to this question.

A new step was taken by the Japanese leadership during the latest conference of the leaders of the leading capitalist countries in Bonn. During the talks between Y. Nakasone, the FRG chancellor, and the U.S. President that were pegged to the conference of the "seven," the Japanese prime minister hinted very unambiguously that he was ready to accept Washington's offer and promote the implementation of the "star wars" concept. However, he voiced a number of reservations, which, if taken into account, would, in his opinion, make the idea more acceptable to the NATO states. And the intensity of the criticism in this connection in Japan itself might also be reduced accordingly. What kind of reservations were they?

For instance, at the Bonn talks the Japanese leader associated himself with the thesis that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" studies must not, he said, run counter to the so-called "concept of deterrence" by means of nuclear weapons. But how then is it possible to speak of the "nonnuclear" nature of "star wars," which Tokyo previously propagandized? And how can this "reservation," advanced as a precondition for Japanese participation in U.S. plans, be reconciled with the status of a nonnuclear power declared by the Japanese Government?

This and other similar reservations did not achieve the desired objective: At the Bonn meeting, the "unity" so pleasing to Washington with regard to the "star wars" idea was not achieved. However, the Japanese leadership possibly earned some political capital with the United States. For it was Japan that was one of the initiators of the attempt, albeit unsuccessful, to formulate a "united" NATO platform on this problem -- with regard to approval of the White House's militarist "initiative," naturally.

But those are political dividends. What in practice is Washington obtaining from Tokyo in the cause of implementing its "initiative" now? Although there has not been any official notification of Japan's participation in research on the "star wars" program, the Japanese Foreign Ministry deemed it possible to repeatedly state that the government "has no objection" to private Japanese firms being involved in these studies. Thus it is simply a question of orders.

Moreover, according to press reports, Japanese-U.S. cooperation is taking place on a number of research projects which journalists are directly linking with the "Strategic Defense Initiative." Thus, the U.S. Scientific Research Center at Los Alamos has links with Osaka University in the sphere of laser beam research and obtains the necessary equipment from certain Japanese manufacturing firms. According to information from ASAHI, over the last 2 years this center has been conducting work to create beam weapons whose main element is a magnet unit produced by the Japanese firm Hitachi Magnetics, a subsidiary enterprise of the well known company Hitachi Kinjoku. Representatives of the two countries cooperate in the sphere of research into neutron and laser beams at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California. One should also add the notable activation of contacts between Japan and the United States on questions linked with the opening up of space: Quite recently the two countries signed an agreement on Japanese participation in the construction of a U.S. orbital space station, although, according to official Japanese claims, this will formally have nothing to do with the "star wars" developments.

At first glance, the scale of cooperation is not yet so great. But even now there is talk of full-scale Japanese involvement in the implementation of the Pentagon's "Strategic Defense Initiative." In a recent TV interview Lieutenant General J. Abrahamson, the head of the "star wars" program, named the fields in which the United States is seeking cooperation with Japan; computer hardware and software, optoelectronic equipment and corresponding technology, and laser equipment. And all this, as the U.S. general noted quite unambiguously, will be sought from Japan in connection with research within the framework of the aforesaid "initiative." Moreover, it matters little to the Pentagon whether its orders are satisfied with the direct sanction of the Japanese Government or via private firms. Results are the main thing.

To all appearances, this approach should not meet with objections in Tokyo, since it accords with the tactics of the Japanese leadership itself. Indeed, the Pentagon will be given real help and the government will retain the right, as it were, to remain on the sidelines, stressing that the question of its "final decision" still continues to be "studied." It was obviously no accident that the Japanese prime minister recently stated in parliament that the question of participation in the "star wars" program will not be a subject of official debates and that the government, "even if it participates in the research, does not intend to conclude any new treaties and agreements with the United States."

Indeed, there is no need for new agreements. Those already concluded are sufficient. In November 1983, Japan linked itself with the United States through an agreement on cooperation in the sphere of military technology, "forgetting" for the sake of its "special partner" the principles adopted in Tokyo regulating arms exports abroad. And today this agreement is starting to be given very specific expression; orders have been received from the Pentagon for the latest military technological developments. According to Japanese press reports citing the country's military circles, it is primarily a question of systems which could be used in the "star wars" program. Does not this mark the start of a "new era" in Japanese-U.S. military cooperation, as was stated in C. Weinberger's talks with the head of the Japan Defense Agency?

Thus the alarm of the Japanese and world public at the dangerous evolution of official Tokyo's position in the direction of increasingly clear indulgence of U.S. hegemonist ambitions, which are currently extending to space, is entirely justified.

As is well known, those who pander to attempts by forces hostile to peace to achieve military superiority and step up confrontation, including by means of the militarization of space, also bear their share of the responsibility for the complication of the situation in the world. Meanwhile voices are being heard in Tokyo saying that Japan's participation in the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" would help it join the ranks of the world's leading powers, including in the military sphere. However, it must be clear that actions in this direction are capable of tangibly damaging the prestige of any country and the dangerous consequences of steps in support of the sinister strategy of war cannot be concealed by any tactics, even the most crafty. The approach to the adventurist "star wars" plans put forward by Washington is a kind of litmus test, -- an indicator of this or that state's attitude to the questions of strengthening peace and international stability and its sincerity in these matters.

CSO: 5200/1061



SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER ON MAY NSC DIRECTIVE 172 ON SDI

PM171335 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Jul 85 Second Edition p 5

[Reserve Colonel V. Chernyshev article: "Nuclear Weapons for 'Star Wars': What the New U.S. National Security Council Directive Indicates"]

[Text] On 30 May the U.S. National Security Council (NSC) adopted Directive 172, which lays out in detail the aims and tasks of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] or, to be more precise, the "star wars" program. As reported by the newspaper NEWSDAY, this directive supersedes all previous statements on the program.

In the newspaper's words, the NSC "has, without any undue fuss, made substantial changes in the 'star wars' program" and "removed certain obscurities." Essentially, however, the document has simply discarded the propaganda camouflage. The plans are formulated more clearly and openly for "internal use," so to speak, so that the planners of "star wars" and weapons developers themselves should not be "confused" by the peace-loving rhetoric and the myths devised to mislead the public.

Contrary to the authors' intention, the document exposes the deliberate falsity of repeated statements by official Washington about the "star wars" program being exclusively "defensive" in nature and designed to facilitate transition from the concept of "mutually assured destruction" to that of "mutually assured survival." But in fact the NSC has endorsed the same old concept of "mutually assured destruction," only on a more sophisticated level, and recognized it as the basis of American policy for the next decades.

Directive 172 also completely debunks another myth, previously created by official Washington, to the effect that the SDI will make nuclear weapons "impotent" and "obsolete" and is based on the use of "nonnuclear systems." The NSC document stated for the first time that nuclear weapons could be an element of the "star wars" program. "We will continue to study promising concepts that presuppose the use of nuclear energy to activate devices capable of destroying ballistic missiles," a main provision of the directive reads. And yet it is precisely the "nonnuclear" aspect of ABM defense that official Washington has been pressing, since, as (Dzh. Ionson), a "star wars" program leader, has acknowledged, the use of nuclear charges "in any form destroys the whole idea." And here we have the truth, which "destroys" the whole hypocritical verbiage now available to the world public.

It emerges from the NSC directive that Reagan's "initiative" has from the very outset been directed toward using the energy of a nuclear explosion and, in particular, the use of third-generation nuclear weapons descended from the atom and hydrogen bombs.

What precisely are these weapons? For many years now work has been under way at the University of California's Lawrence Livermore radiation laboratory to create x-ray lasers using the energy from a nuclear explosion. A space laser battle station is conceived as a nuclear installation with 50 lasers mounted around it automatically guided onto the targets to be destroyed. The system resembles a kind of "hedgehog" whose "body," a nuclear installation, is surrounded by "spines," the straight barrels of laser cannon. This whole system is activated by the explosion of a nuclear charge.

The X-ray laser was given its first trial run in an underground silo in the Nevada desert on 14 November 1980. The test was code-named ("Dofin"). Three months later the magazine AVIATION WEEK and SPACE TECHNOLOGY wrote: "The X-ray lasers created on the basis of the successful ('Dofin') test, when deployed on a combat platform, are so small that it is possible to send a sufficient number of them into orbit in a single compartment of a reusable spacecraft."

The same magazine reported in 1983 that an output equivalent to 400 terawatts was obtained during underground tests of the X-ray laser. One terawatt ("tera" means "monster" in Greek) is the power capable of being yielded by a solar reflector with an 18-km radius. A mirror with a 600-km radius could generate 1,000 terawatts! Such power is in excess of the total power of all mechanisms of any type functioning on the earth. These are the kind of fantastic "monsters" Washington is seeking to make use of for its hegemonist ends and with which it is seeking to flood near-earth space and exploit as space strike weapons!

G. Keyworth, scientific adviser to the U.S. President, speaking at the Lawrence laboratory in January 1983, was enthusiastic about the X-ray laser, describing its creation as "a very important program that will seriously influence the country's stance in the defense sphere in future decades." D. (Razer), a laser specialist and zealous advocate of "star wars," has been even franker, stating that the country possessing space lasers will possess the "longest 'big stick' in history -- the ability to control outer space and then establish its supremacy on earth."

In March THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote that the X-ray laser, which will be activated by a nuclear explosion in space, could perfectly well become the main weapon...Although administration officials no longer describe the laser activated by a nuclear explosion as the basis of "star wars," the newspaper points out, research in this field is being carried out at an accelerated rate.

NSC directive 172 has confirmed that the "star wars" program is nuclear in character and that it will not only make nuclear weapons "obsolete" but aims to augment them with a new class of nuclear arms intended to be sited in space.

All the dreams of brandishing the "longest big stick in history" at the world are, of course, doomed to fail. The USSR will not allow the military strategic balance to be upset. And it would be a good thing if some people in Washington grasped the truth of the fact, often proved by history, that every "big stick," no matter how long, has two ends.

CSO: 5200/1061

SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE IN SWEDEN HITS SDI

PM101601 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jul 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Sychev dispatch under the rubric "Topics of the Day": "Preventing the Militarization of Space"]

[Text] Stockholm -- A 3-day international conference devoted to problems of the extension of the arms race to space and its consequences for international security has ended in Saltsjobaden.

Most participants voiced unanimous opinions [as published] on many questions. The documents adopted by working groups emphasize the urgent need to strictly observe the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Defense Systems signed by the United States and the USSR in 1972. The package of military and political reasons which prompted the conclusion of this treaty has remained unchanged since that time. An organic link exists between defensive and offensive arms. For this reason it is impossible to achieve a limitation and substantial reduction of nuclear arms and consequently strengthened stability and security on the planet without retaining the ABM Treaty and preventing the spread of the arms race to space.

The reply of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to an appeal by the U.S. public organization "Union of Concerned Scientists," which was submitted by the Soviet delegation, evoked great interest among the conference participants.

"The propositions contained in the reply accord with the thoughts of U.S. scientists," Professor S. Drell of the Stanford Research Institute said. "It is extremely important to preserve the existing ABM Treaty. Proceeding from this treaty it is possible to achieve strengthened security and eliminate the risk of war."

"The Pentagon's plans are extremely dangerous. The 'defense initiative' -- no matter how it is presented in Washington -- is a means of aggression rather than defense. The only way toward stability in the international situation and toward strengthened security is the quantitative and qualitative reduction and elimination of the first strike potential," Academician Ye. P. Velikhov, chairman of the "Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat" committee and vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, said.

The conference has shown the great concern of the public of different countries at the prospect of the spread of arms into space. The U.S. Administration's stance is evoking increasingly sharp and convincing criticism even on the part of its allies and of Americans themselves who view the problem of war and peace soberly.

## SPACE ARMS

### USSR MARSHAL AKHROMEYEV WRITES IN SPANISH PAPER ON SDI, ABM TREATY

PM171019 Madrid MUNDO OBRERO in Spanish 11-17 Jul 85 pp 38-39

[Article by USSR Armed Forces Chief of Staff Marshal S. Akhromeyev: "United States Is Promoting Arms Race"]

[Text] The international situation remains tense and dangerous because of the arms race that the U.S. Administration and some of its NATO allies have conducted over the past few years.

Everything seems to indicate that U.S. imperialism intends to continue that race and increase the danger of war. But if in the current situation all the forces of peace unite, forming a common front, it will be possible to ensure a stronger and more stable peace.

The negotiations on nuclear and space weapons that the USSR is holding with the United States serve to preserve and strengthen peace. The attainment of greater international security depends to a considerable extent on whether or not we succeed in strengthening the international legal foundations of the arms limitation process; preserving and not destroying what has already been accomplished in this field and concluding new agreements. It is of considerable importance to preserve the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems (the ABM treaty).

The limitation, much less the reduction of nuclear weapons, is inconceivable in the context of the nuclearization of space. The creation and deployment in orbit of offensive space weapons entail a numerical increase in and modernization of strategic nuclear weapons. There is an objective reciprocal relationship between offensive strategic systems and defensive strategic systems. Such is the logic of nuclear confrontation. The construction of an extensive space-based ABM defense system, conceived in the United States, has a marked aggressive dimension.

In this situation, how will the other side -- that is, the USSR -- act? The truth is that it has no choice but inevitably to restore the strategic balance and increase its offensive strategic forces, complementing them with defensive systems.

The militarization of space is causing an uncontrollable arms race in all directions, making it even more intense and dangerous, as well as giving rise to a considerable reduction in strategic stability.

U.S. leaders understood this well long ago. In 1967, Robert McNamara, then defense secretary, said that in light of the U.S. creation of an ABM defense system the USSR

"will have no alternative but to increase its offensive forces' potential." Reflecting on the matter, Senator Kennedy stated: "The deployment of an ABM defense system would involve us in an arms race unprecedented in the history of weapons." Former President Richard Nixon stated that the most powerful ABM defense system the United States could create would be unable to save the United States from catastrophic damage in a retaliatory strike.

Acknowledgment of the objective link between offensive strategic systems and defensive strategic systems, of the ability of large-scale ABM defense systems to cause an arms race, and of the impossibility of gaining advantages over the other side in it caused the sides in the first USSR-U.S. negotiations to limit strategic arms negotiations, which began in 1969 (Salt I), to agreeing on the need to concentrate on preparing agreements limiting ABM defense systems. This enabled the USSR and the United States to sign two important documents in May 1972: the Treaty on the limitation of ABM Systems and the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms.

#### ABM Treaty

The politicomilitary significance of the ABM treaty is considerable. Among other documents, it serves as a basis for relations between the two sides. In signing it the USSR and the United States acknowledged that in the nuclear age only mutual restraint in the field of ABM defense will make it possible to advance toward nuclear arms limitation and reduction, that is, to contain the strategic arms race as a whole.

In the treaty itself this approach takes shape in a set of clauses formulated in specific terms. Thus the treaty forbids the United States and the USSR from deploying ABM systems nationwide -- that is, extensive ABM systems -- and from creating the infrastructure for that defense. Each side can have an ABM defense system limited to a single region (capital or ICBM base), within which it can deploy up to 100 ABM launchers, no more than 100 antiballistic missiles in launch positions, and a limited number of radar stations.

It is forbidden to create, test, or deploy sea-, air-, or space-based ABM defense systems or components or ground-based systems on mobile launchers.

Moreover, the sides agreed not to transfer to other countries and not to deploy outside their national territories the ABM defense systems or components limited by the treaty.

The Soviet-U.S. limitation treaty lays down an essential framework for subsequent negotiations with a view to limiting and reducing nuclear weapons.

The ABM treaty has been in force for over 10 years. During that period the two sides have met on two occasions (1977 and 1982) to analyze it, and they were unanimous in acknowledging that it still accords with their interests and needs no changes or amendments.

If the treaty limiting ABM defense systems became invalid for one reason or another, the basis underpinning the negotiations on nuclear arms limitation would disappear. In fact, it would mean their failure and an uncontrolled arms race for decades.

Washington knows all this, of course. It also knows that the ABM treaty is a stabilizing factor. Moreover, members of the U.S. Administration take every opportunity to refer to the need to "strengthen the operation" of the treaty. Yet they have long been intent on undermining it.

## Reagan's "SDI"

The U.S. Administration's actions aimed at designing a new kind of weapon -- offensive space devices -- are incompatible with the ABM treaty principles. In proclaiming the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] and beginning to make an extensive ABM system equipped with space elements, Washington is seeking to torpedo that treaty. Some U.S. leaders, especially in the Pentagon, (R. Perle and others) -- not concealing U.S. ambitions regarding space -- call bluntly for abandonment of the ABM treaty.

The U.S. Administration denies the incompatibility of the "star wars" plans with the principles of this highly important document. It resorts to maneuvers and seeks loopholes in the formulas of the treaty itself in order to justify the militarization of space in the eyes of society. This is being done in various ways.

First way: Washington statesmen deliberate a great deal and even forthrightly assert that the work to create an extensive space-based ABM defense system is only harmless technological research, which, according to them, does not prevent implementation of the ABM treaty. The U.S. mass media disseminate this view extensively.

In fact the situation is different. The ABM treaty (Article 5) forbids creating and testing space-based ABM defense systems or components, systems that are precisely what the United States' "harmless research" is aimed at.

Second way: Taking advantage of the lack of information among broad sections of society, U.S. Administration representatives assert that the ABM treaty clauses apply only to ABM systems and components that existed at the time of its signing, listed among "ABM defense components" since Article 2 of the treaty does not mention them.  
[sentence as published]

The treaty clauses stipulate all systems aimed at combating strategic ballistic missiles or their components in flight trajectories. Since the ABM defense components created within the framework of the SDI are intended to achieve precisely this aim, all the treaty provisions -- in the first place the ban on developing, testing, and deploying space-based ABM defense systems or components -- apply fully to them.

Third Way: The U.S. architects of the "star wars" program are especially zealous in disseminating the following view: The ABM treaty not only does not ban but even advocates the designing of "exotic" ABM devices (lasers, beams, projectiles, and so forth). For instance, P. Nitze, adviser to the President and to the secretary of state in the Geneva negotiations, forthrightly presents the designing of space-based ABM components based on different physical principles as an action authorized by the ABM treaty.

This is a clear falsification of the facts. In fact, the agreed declaration attached to the treaty does not rule out the possibility of the sides' developing ABM devices "based on different physical principles," but only within the framework of the restrictions stipulated by the treaty as a whole; that is, in a single, authorized area.

Fourth way: Opting for destruction of the ABM treaty, U.S. statesmen are seeking to use the fact that the treaty itself stipulates the possibility of introducing corresponding amendments in its text (Article 14). For this reason they say that the U.S. actions contrary to the treaty can be legalized in some way -- for instance, by revising this document or introducing into its text amendments agreed upon with the Soviet side.

The USSR will not, of course, agree to the treaty limiting ABM systems being reduced to a cover for the U.S. policy aimed at ensuring an arms race in space-based ABM systems.

Fifth way: In the general course taken by the U.S. Administration with a view to torpedoing the ABM treaty, accusations that the USSR is violating contract obligations are intertwined with a malicious spirit.

In saying so, the U.S. side very frequently speculates about the Soviet radar station being constructed near Krasnoyarsk.

The unfounded argument is used that this radar station is an ABM early warning station and for this reason should be sited not in the Krasnoyarsk area but on the periphery of the USSR and oriented outward, as is required by Article 6 of the treaty.

However, the radar station being built near Krasnoyarsk is not subject to the restrictions stipulated by Article 6 of the ABM treaty and has nothing to do with the early warning system for missile attacks. That station is intended to trace space devices. The U.S. side has been informed of this. The U.S. side's attempt to continue to "indict" the USSR pursues only the aim of justifying the course followed by the United States itself, the course of torpedoing the ABM treaty.

In the USSR no preparations are being made to create a territorial ABM defense system. No work is being done on antiaircraft defense systems that conflicts with the ABM treaty provisions.

The USSR, the Soviet leadership has declared repeatedly with the utmost determination, does not seek military superiority, but it will not tolerate superiority over itself on earth or in space. The promoters of "star wars" should not forget, USSR Defense Minister and Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov emphasized in his replies to TASS, that the "creation of offensive space weapons will inevitably make the security of the United States itself and its allies more vulnerable."

Preservation and strict observance of the ABM treaty are a guarantee of successful progress toward the attainment of agreements in the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space weapons. CPSU General Secretary Comrade M.S. Gorbachev has stressed that an arms race cannot be reconciled with negotiations on disarmament. The Soviet Union will not promote such a course and will not slacken its efforts to achieve tangible and mutually acceptable agreements that will make it possible to end the arms race and promote disarmament.

CSO: 5200/1061



SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: U.S. SUB PLANS VIOLATE SALT II

PM101137 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English 7 Jul 85 p 7

[Interview with United States and Canada Institute Deputy Director Radomir Bogdanov by Boris Vladimirov: "What is Being Dismantled?" -- date, place not given]

[Text] According to Heinrich Heine's witty remark, the Trojan war was contained in the egg hatched by Leda. According to the Greek legend, Leda, visited by Zeus in the form of a swan, gave birth to Helen of Troy, and the war started because of Helen. The present policy of Washington militarists is the hawks' egg of nuclear war jointly being hatched by the White House and the Pentagon.

This was said by deputy director of the Institute of United States and Canadian Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences Radomir Bogdanov, D. Sc. (History), in an interview concerning President Reagan's recent statement regarding the U.S. intention to "continue observing" SALT 2.

"Literally a month before Reagan announced this on May 10, he said that the United States had no cause to comply with SALT 2," went on Radomir Bogdanov. "But what really happened? Can it be that Washington is not violating the treaty? Paul Warnke, former director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, for example, thinks that Reagan was only pretending to make concessions to the Soviet side. In reality, the White House is moving towards destroying the treaty system that is curbing the arms race.

"Washington's intention to destroy SALT 2 is dictated by its plans to tip the nuclear balance in the USA's favour. But the hopes for superiority in possessing a 'superweapon' are fraught with a superthreat.

"Asked in an interview whether he believed in his heart of hearts that the Russians would be the first to drop nuclear bombs on the Americans, U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger replied that what he believed in his heart of hearts did not matter. But in his heart of hearts Weinberger, of course, does not believe in the existence of such a threat for the USA.

"The human heart is a mystery, they say. With the world situation what it is through the fault of the American Administration, someone's heart may perhaps prompt a correct decision.

"One should bear in mind that the policy of lies has resulted in numerous tragedies. Policy can and should be the focus of truth. Real, as opposed to declarative, policy is not mere propaganda rhetoric filled with words about peace and democracy, it is the sum

total of specific deeds. If one tries, as some politicians, to hide behind words their aggressive plans, the moment arrives sooner or later when the sum total of practical deeds lays bare the actual goings-on."

[Vladimirov] "How can SALT 2 be practically violated?"

[Bogdanov] "On the basis of Pentagon plans, the new American nuclear submarine Alaska which has a Trident system with 24 MIRVs on board is to undergo tests this August. With the commissioning of this submarine, the USA will exceed the 1,200 limit on strategic missiles set by the Soviet-American treaty limiting strategic offensive weapons.

"So that the terms of the Treaty are observed it is required to decommission a Poseidon submarine and dismantle its 16 missile launchers after the new generation submarine has been commissioned. The WASHINGTON POST says that, according to the project submitted to the U.S. President by the National Security Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Pentagon, the USA will only remove the missiles from the submarine without dismantling the launchers. The submarine would later be converted into a sea-based carrier of cruise missiles.

"Moreover, the President has given people to understand that his decision on decommissioning the Poseidon submarine is his last 'concession' to SALT 2. Washington is simply playing for time in an attempt to lull public opinion, to finally 'dismantle' the treaty and start a wide-scale buildup of new types of strategic weapons: MXs, Midgetman missiles, B-1B, and others. The House of Representatives has just voted, in the course of debates on the bill for the next fiscal year, military appropriations amounting to \$582 million for the production of the latest D-5 missiles to be based on Trident submarines.

"The administration is today divided on the issue of observing the treaty. Curiously enough, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger who wants the USA to fully renounce SALT 2 has been opposed by his own military advisers who have pointed out to him and the President the advantages of complying with the limits set in the treaty."

[Vladimirov] "What is the attitude in NATO countries to the White House intentions?"

[Bogdanov] "Judging by recent interviews of government spokesmen in a number of NATO countries, the USA's West European allies are against renouncing SALT 2. They reasonably note that this step on the part of the USA would be a setback for arms control. NATO's Secretary-General Lord Carrington, for example, has made it clear to the Reagan administration that refusing to comply with SALT 2 may cause a hostile reaction among the public in NATO countries. Voicing a rather widely held point of view, one European political leader said that renouncing SALT 2 would in principle make it difficult for the United States and NATO to defend the thesis that the Reagan administration is sincere on the issue of arms control.

"It is to be hoped that Washington should finally understand the consequences of the position of the White House towards SALT 2 and its continued efforts to blow up agreements on limiting arms or to modify them so that they should fit into the U.S. armament plans.

"As the recent TASS statement read, 'One should not be deluded that the U.S. side will be allowed to determine as it thinks fit which obligations should be observed and which should not. It is a dangerous misapprehension to expect the other side to adapt itself to such a line of the USA.'

"The Soviet Union will draw appropriate conclusions from the steps undertaken by Washington, prompted by the interests of its security and the security of its allies."

CSO: 5200/1064

SALT-START ISSUES

MOSCOW BROADCAST TO BRITAIN ON REAGAN SALT II DECISION

LD282324 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 28 Jun 85

[Text] Coming up next is commentary. Our observer, (Vitaliy Vladimirov) returns to the subject of President Reagan's recent decision to go along with the Salt II agreement. This is what he writes:

Though the noise caused by the decision has died away, arguments still continue in Washington. Some ardent opponents to any arms control agreements tend to charge the administration almost with treachery, sometimes even placing the responsibility on the president's wife. Others feel that Reagan has moved to more central positions, as the WASHINGTON POST said. Still others claim that Reagan is a pragmatist.

Presidential advisers and London politicians try to present Reagan's decision as a generous gesture in favor of the Soviet Union but they will fail in their attempts because there was no such gesture. It was all hypocrisy and deception. The action clearly confirmed the stability of the Washington course of violating commitments in the sphere of arms control. The United States has been found guilty of such violations many times. Suffice it to say that the president has actually limited the term of the official observance of the SALT II treaty by the United States by November this year when the situation will be studied again. If by that time the Soviet Union does not prove it does not violate the treaty and does not moderate its stand at the Geneva talks, Washington will wash its hands, which means it will assume the right to openly violate the treaty.

In other words, at this stage the American side interprets the situation in the following way: The United States scrupulously stands by its commitments and demonstrates true restraint, while the only thing the Soviet Union does is to violate these commitments. This slanderous approach of the United States to the SALT II treaty that has been exposed by the facts many times became the foundation for the presidential decision. It is clear that Washington intends to act contrary to, or in circumvention of, the treaty and describe its steps as response to alleged Soviet violations.

It is not accidental that the White House has given orders to the defense secretary and Joint Chiefs of Staff to outline by November a plan of concrete measures to counteract alleged Soviet violations in the past and future. A

prominent American journalist Joseph Harsch, has said: President Reagan would clearly be happy to axe SALT II.

But why hasn't the President axed it? This is a purely tactical consideration. One of the main reasons was the desire to most effectively neutralize the American and European public opinion that now unequivocally favors topical [as heard] agreements on reducing the arms race. The refusal of the United States to join the control process would only further activate the American and West European peace movement which Washington and London are trying to suppress by every means. Anti-American allies in Western Europe, the latest step of the White House probably had two purposes. By meeting their demand to observe the treaty, the administration wanted to fix up Atlantic solidarity that is splitting on many military, political and trade and economic issues. After strengthening this solidarity, it would want to win West European approval for its "Star Wars" adventure, an adventure that arouses grave concern in the continent, according to the NATO secretary general, Lord Carrington,

Summoning it all up, we can say Reagan's SALT II decision is aimed first of all at gaining time because, as the WASHINGTON POST said, allies and senators will find it more difficult to attack the president when he takes the next step against SALT II. The ball is this unseemly deceptive game has been placed in the hands of the Pentagon, which is likely to hit the hopes of nations for peace, security and the curbing of the insatiable arms race.

CSO: 5200/1064

**SALT/START ISSUES**

**IZVESTIYA CONDEMNS CIA REPORT ON SOVIET ICBM'S**

**PM101037 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jul 85 Morning Edition p 5**

[Own correspondent V. Soldatov "Rejoinder": "Misinformation to Order"]

[Text] New York -- The CIA leadership took an unusual step by distributing a copy of a top-secret report to leading American legislators at the end of June. It was also unusual that the said department agreed to a discussion of this report in open hearings of two Senate committees.

What is going on? It turns out that the report deals with "trends" in the development of Soviet nuclear arms. And more than that. In the opinion of analysts of the CIA and other U.S. intelligence agencies who participated in compiling the report, these "trends" are plainly menacing. The Soviet Union has supposedly made a "tremendous effort" and achieved "great successes" in creating ICBM's. By 1995, the CIA specialists claim, the Soviet Union could double the number of its ICBM's. The report's authors also claim that in the next few years the Soviet Union will acquire mobile ballistic missiles capable of reaching U.S. territory.

CSO: 5200/1064

5 August 1985

## SALT/START ISSUES

## MOSCOW DENIES PENTAGON ACCUSATION OF ARMS VIOLATION

LD102209 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 10 Jul 85

[Text] As REUTER has reported, Gaffney, a deputy assistant to the U.S. secretary of defense, has accused Moscow of violating the 1972 treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems. Here is Viktor Levin at the microphone:

[Levin] The statement by the high-ranking Pentagon official to the effect that, as he said, the Soviet Union is violating the antimissile defense treaty, is far from being the only slanderous attack made on our country. Gaffney went so far as to assert that supposedly the USSR, in posing the question of the need to observe the provisions of the treaty, is engaging in rhetoric, and on this basis the deputy assistant to the U.S. defense secretary tried to present the Soviet Union's principled position in a false light.

However, as soon as Gaffney himself moved from unsubstantiated statements to what he was striving to present as facts, it came to light that he and nobody else was engaging in rhetoric and moreover a rhetoric of the basest sort.

For example, the Pentagon official assured his listeners that supposedly an example of the violation of the antimissile defense treaty by the Soviet Union -- he even said that it was the clearest violation -- is the construction of a radar station in the area of Krasnoyarsk. But Gaffney cannot but know that in reality this station has nothing to do with the early warning system of a missile attack. It is intended for tracking [slezheniye] space objects [obyekt] and the U.S. side has received an authoritative explanation on this. But nonetheless, counting on gullible people, the Pentagon is continuing to spread deliberately false rumors, trying to cast aspersions on the Soviet Union and at the same time to justify its own real actions aimed at undermining the antimissile defense treaty.

Gaffney himself blurted out the fact that this treaty, which has key significance in restraining the arms race, is a thorn in the side of the bosses of the U.S. military and industrial complex. After the slanderous attacks addressed to the USSR, he, without taking a breath, literally stated the following. I quote: The United States considers that the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems cannot be useful until there is no alternative.

As for what is implied by alternative, there is no doubt -- it is the program for creating offensive space weapons. So it becomes clear that the slander is called on to serve as a mask to conceal the Pentagon's course directed toward its true intentions

of wrecking the antimissile defense treaty so as to remove impediments on the path to creating weapons for "star wars."

It must be said that the utterances made by Gaffney do not sparkle with originality. All of this has been said before in Washington. However, what is noteworthy is that his remarks were made very recently, and in particular after Comrade Gorbachev had plainly expounded the position of the Soviet Union both on space weapons and with regard to the antimissile defense treaty, in the reply to the appeal of the American Union of Concerned Scientists, and this account of our position totally destroys slanderous attacks.

CSO: 5200/1064



SALT/START ISSUES

PRAVDA: MIDGETMAN PROGRAM WILL COMPLICATE SUMMIT, GENEVA TALKS

PM101326 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jul 85 First Edition p 5

[Unidentified own correspondent dispatch: "Cash for the Concern"]

[Text] New York, 9 Jul -- The Pentagon has concluded a contract worth \$447.6 million with Martin Marietta -- one of the largest aerospace concerns -- for the preliminary development and testing of the new ground-based Midgetman strategic missile. Official Washington intends it to enter its arsenals in the next decade.

This decision, THE NEW YORK TIMES reports, was taken after a series of tests of Midgetman launchers at the White Sands, New Mexico, missile test range. Variants of them were presented by the Boeing, McDonnell Douglas, and General Dynamics concerns. The order was won by the Martin Marietta model.

As is well known, the Pentagon is already pushing ahead with the creation of the ground-based MX missile with 10 warheads. Congress has allocated \$2.1 billion for the production of 21 missiles next year.

At the same time a decision has been taken in Washington to develop another missile: much smaller, more mobile, and with a single warhead. According to the Pentagon strategists' schemes these missiles are needed for Midgetman to "survive" an enemy's first strike.

As many specialists here in the field of nuclear strategy have been forced to admit, the MX and the Midgetman, for whose development Congress has already allocated more than \$700 million in the next fiscal year, are first strike weapons. Moreover, the creation of these two missiles, they point out, violates the SALT II treaty.

This irresponsible nuclear course, sober-minded politicians and public figures are warning, will only make mutual understanding between the sides more difficult during the planned Soviet-U.S. Geneva summit in November and consequently will complicate the development of urgent accords at the talks on nuclear and space arms.

The CIA report did not create a furor in the Senate. It was cited at length only by senators known for their right-wing views. And not many members of the public attended the hearings.

But a curious circumstance came to light at the hearings: The CIA report was sent to the Senate at the request of the White House. So said a Pentagon official. The purpose of the report, he said, is to strengthen public support for the White House's request for

increased U.S. military spending in the next fiscal year. Americans, as public opinion polls testify, do not share the White House's desire to continue rapidly building up the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Reflecting those sentiments and fearing for the country's economic future, the Senate and the House of Representatives reduced the appropriations requested by the administration for military purposes in their draft budgets for fiscal 1986.

The White House is reluctant to accept this and is taking countermeasures. The CIA's "warning" is one of these measures.

Another purpose of the report, which depicts the Soviet Union's nuclear arms in hyperbolic tones against the background of a U.S. "lag," in the opinion of a Pentagonite who refused to give his name, is to ensure the support of Americans and of U.S. allies for President Reagan's possible steps to increase American nuclear arms. It is a question, in particular, of the Midgetman mobile intercontinental nuclear missile, which is being created at an accelerated pace in the United States in violation of the SALT II treaty. The Congress recently allocated several hundred million dollars more for work on creating this missile.

The American ruling elite has accumulated great experience in deceiving the general public. In the sixties Washington's propaganda apparatus compiled a forgery about a "huge gap" in missile arms in the Soviet Union's favor. At the end of the seventies the "window of vulnerability" saw the light of day and was intensively speculated on by the administration now in power. With the passage of time it turned out that there had not been any "window of vulnerability" at all, nor any "gaps" in missile arms. But the deed was done: The Republicans came to power on a wave of chauvinist sentiment created by them and then began implementing the vast program for "rearming America."

The CIA's present "warnings," compiled on White House orders, are not worth a plugged nickel either. A prominent Pentagon staffer admitted this in a moment of candor. "The CIA's predictions," he told a NEW YORK TIMES correspondent, "are only assumptions, and in 5 or 10 years' time it could turn out that they were wrong... There could also be a lot of misinformation in the report."

However, this circumstance does not embarrass the administration. Misinformation serves its interests.

CSO: 5200/1064

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA DENIES BUSH CLAIM THAT SS-20 DEPLOYMENTS CONTINUE

PM220845 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jul 85 First Edition p 5

["Rejoinder: Deceit Is Deceit"]

[Text] The days are few and far between when U.S. administration spokesmen do not appear in the corridors of West European countries' government institutions, whispering to their interlocutors about the "Russians' perfidy." Recently, for example, they have been trying to persuade those who are prepared to listen that the Soviet Union is continuing its deployment of SS-20 missiles, despite the declared moratorium.

Evidently hoping that the higher the rank of the disseminator, the faster such malicious calumnies against the USSR will be believed, Washington did not hesitate to use U.S. Vice President G. Bush to this end.

But deceit remains deceit, irrespective of the official position occupied by the individual engaged in it. But the higher the position, the greater the responsibility assumed by anyone making false claims. The USSR cleaves firmly to the pledges it has adopted. This applies, inter alia, to the moratorium it has declared on deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the country in the period up to November 1985.

The further development of events in this matter depends entirely on the United States: Will it respond to the USSR's appeal to end deployment of its medium-range missiles in West Europe?

CSO: 5200/1312

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### TASS HITS FRG MISSILE ACQUISITIONS POLICY

LN161641 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 16 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS -- TASS commentator Petr Lvov writes: West Germany has allocated funds to replace its arsenal of U.S. Pershing 1a rockets, REUTER news agency reported. Quoting West German Defense Ministry spokesman Ulrich Hundt, it said his country was considering the development of a medium-range missile of its own.

The idea of a West German medium-range missile attests to a dangerous trend whereby Bonn is becoming increasingly involved in NATO military preparations.

Nearly all restrictions on military production in West Germany have been lifted under Washington's pressure over recent years, and West German monopolies now are allowed to manufacture virtually all kinds of arms and military hardware, barring weapons of mass annihilation.

Also under pressure from across the ocean, West Germany has over recent years been converted into a NATO nuclear-missile launching site, and thus peace is again being threatened from German soil for the first time in post-war years.

In another resounding development, Jurgen Todenhoefer, an expert of the CDU/CSU faction in the Bundestag, recently called for a European council to be formed to deal with the question of nuclear defenses, which would command all nuclear arsenals in Western Europe. He insisted that the right of vote in the council be enjoyed also by the West European countries which do not have nuclear weapons, for example West Germany. The aim so is to gain access to newest kinds of weapons by hook or by crook.

As the manifestations of militarism in West German policy have increased, so has the pace of the military training of the country's population. In Lower Saxony, which is one of the largest West German lands, a group of senior pupils has taken a week-long course in military training at the local garrison under a directive from the local school department. Among other things, the students took part in a practice shooting at a firing range. The outrage among the country's democratic public was so great that Georg-Berndt Oschatz, the land government's minister of culture, launched an inquiry into the case.

No matter how the investigation ends, the militarist nature of the policy pursued by the present government in Bonn is already beyond doubt.

CSO: 5200/1062

## CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

### USSR'S GRINEVSKIY HITS U.S. 'NEGATIVE STANCE'

LD152114 Moscow TASS in English 2053 GMT 15 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow July 15 TASS -- During the work of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe it became possible not only to come to know better the stance of the sides and the ways for making progress but also to see the difficulties that hold back such progress, said ambassador at large Oleg Grinevskiy, the head of the Soviet delegation at the Stockholm conference.

Speaking on Soviet television tonight, he said that despite stubborn opposition on the part of the United States, the proposal of the socialist countries on the non-use of military force was firmly established in the fabric of the talks. Many neutral and nonaligned countries now support the proposal of Cyprus for adopting a solemn declaration in Stockholm prohibiting the use of force in any of its forms. France, Italy, Spain, Greece and other Western European countries also stand for making the principle of non-use of force more efficient.

Of course, far from all NATO countries are prepared for practical talks. Although the United States kept making promises all through the year, it failed to give a more or less comprehensible answer concerning its stance on that major international problem, said the head of the Soviet delegation at the Stockholm conference.

The proposal submitted by the socialist countries on the notification of major exercises of ground, air and naval forces, major movements and redeployments of troops gave a new direction to the discussion of military issues. Against the background of these large-scale initiatives, NATO proposals on notifying only of the exercises conducted by ground forces and on making available intelligence data on the deployment and structure of forces of the European states look like an overt attempt at winning unilateral military advantages for the U.S., for the main strike forces of the United States remain outside the framework of such data.

As before, one of the important and timely questions on the agenda of the Stockholm conference, Oleg Grinevskiy went on to say, is the question raised by the socialist countries concerning the limitation of the scale of military exercises which, if we look at the latest NATO exercises, assume such a scope that it is difficult to tell them from preparations for the deployment for the beginning of actual combat operations. Nonaligned countries favor such limitations. And again, the matter turns on the negative stance of the United States.

The solution of this and some other questions could bring Europe back to the road of detente. As the debates at the Stockholm conference showed, a mutually acceptable solution of these issues can be found. But for this purpose it is important that the United States take a constructive stand and at long last embark on practical talks, as proposed by the socialist countries and the nonaligned countries, Oleg Grinevskiy said in conclusion.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

SOVIET-AUSTRIAN CONSULTATIONS

PM161510 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jul 85 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry"]

[Excerpt]

Soviet-Austrian consultations have been held at the USSR Foreign Ministry during which there was a detailed exchange of opinions on topical international problems included on the agenda of the routine 40th session of the UN General Assembly. The sides also discussed in detail the situation at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe.

Taking part in the consultations were V.F. Petrovskiy, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium, and H. Gleissner and A. Rohan, chiefs of department at the Austrian Foreign Ministry.

M.S. Kapitsa, USSR deputy foreign minister, received H. Gleissner and A. Rohan and had a conversation with them. H. Liedermann, Austrian ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

CSO: 5200/1063

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

FURTHER SOVIET COMMENT ON U.S. BINARY ARMS PROGRAM

TASS Statement

LD101349 Moscow TASS in English 1344 GMT 10 Jul 85

["TASS statement"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 10 TASS -- The House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress recently followed the Senate in adopting the decision to allocate funds for the production of binary chemical weapons. Although the date for the beginning of the production is given as 1987 and the adopted decision is accompanied by some reservations, all this does not change the essence of the matter. The United States has made practical steps towards adding to its military arsenal a new, ever more dangerous kind of barbarous weapons -- the deadly nerve mixture.

According to Washington strategists, the binary weapon production is to become part of an extensive programme of developing advanced weapons, designed to ensure the U.S. a military superiority. Hardly a day passes without Washington discussing and adopting decisions linked to the development and deployment of ever new arms systems: MX and Midgetman intercontinental ballistic missiles, missile-firing submarines, strategic aircraft, strike space systems.

The decisions leading to the binary weapon production were adopted by the United States at a time when talks are continuing at the disarmament conference in Geneva on working out a convention on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons, which is favoured by an overwhelming majority of states. It is now clear why the United States is so stubbornly trying to lead into an impasse the discussion of this topical problem at the conference.

It is planned to deploy binary weapons chiefly on the territory of U.S. Western European allies. As with the Pershing II and cruise missiles of a long range, which are being deployed in several states of Western Europe, the plans lay bare the perfidious designs of Washington which would like to remain on the sidelines and counts on exposing the territory of its allies to a retaliatory strike. The binary weapons would thus become yet another source of ominous menace in the densely populated countries of Western Europe.



The U.S. plans to start producing binary chemical weapons cannot but arouse serious concern and indignation. The U.S. Government will bear full responsibility for the consequences of this step. It is a direct duty of the peoples to prevent the new crime being prepared against peace and humanity.

The Soviet Union strongly condemns the plans of producing and deploying binary weapons. Consistently standing for a cardinal resolution of the question of the prohibition and destruction of all kinds of chemical weapons, the USSR reiterates its readiness actively to cooperate with all peace-loving states to achieve this goal.

#### Professor Discusses Legal Aspects

LD121621 Moscow TASS in English 1536 GMT 12 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow, 12 Jul (TASS)--United States plans to start producing binary chemical weapons have aroused grave concern among the Soviet public, Professor Yuriy Nazarkin of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations said in a TASS interview.

The United States, he noted, has adopted plans to manufacture binary munitions at a time when talks are continuing at the Geneva conference on disarmament to work out a convention on the prohibition and elimination of chemical warfare agents.

The United States has already made repeated violations of various international legal documents banning the use of chemical weapons, the Soviet scientist said. Despite the fact that the United States has signed the Geneva protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare, which is among the most important international legal documents, the Pentagon has used chemical weapons in Vietnam, causing numerous civilian casualties there.

Nazarkin noted that some Western countries have attempted to secure a revision of the Geneva protocol so that to legalize the U.S. criminal actions.

Touching on the Soviet stand on chemical weapons, he stressed that the USSR is consistently in favor of a cardinal solution to the problem of outlawing and eliminating all kinds of chemical weapons. "As long as these weapons exist in the world, the danger of their being used will also persist. The use of chemical weapons will hit also subsequent generations," the Soviet scientist warned.

#### Moscow TV Commentary

LD212128 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1849 GMT 21 Jun 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Georgiy Zubkov]

[Text] In the first edition of the "World Today" I spoke about the allocations for next year voted by the U.S. House of Representatives on various articles of the military budget. In particular, it supported the allocation of \$2.5 billion for the development of space weapons; \$582 million for the production of new missiles for Trident-class submarines; \$124.5 million are to

be spent on creating a new binary chemical weapon. This binary weapon consists of two components: only at the moment the shell is fired, or the missile launched, or bomb dropped, do they unite and turn into a lethal poisonous substance without smell or color. [video shows still of bomb]

American military propaganda claims that this allows chemical weapons to be made safe during production and also during transportation or storage. But the truth is kept from the public. The truth is that conditions are being created for chemical weapons to be spread, due to the organization of secret production of the components of binary nerve gases--and not only in the United States itself but also in Europe and third countries--this is what the United States is making great efforts towards. The United States has already about 100 different types of chemical weapons. At least 150,000 metric tons of them have been stockpiled--more than 3 million munitions filled with poison. In the opinion of specialists, this is enough to wipe out the whole population of the earth 50 times over. But this is not enough for the Pentagon and the American imperialists. They are actively pursuing preparations for chemical war. The United States' program of chemical rearmament is aimed at achieving the U.S. administration's main strategic aim--securing military superiority over the Soviet Union--and with the minimum risk of their own country being affected in a war. Hence, the plans for the militarization of space, the deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe, and finally, chemical weapons. [video shows stockpiles of barrels; men in protective clothing working in lab; soldiers in field, red smoke rising from ground; soldiers in gas masks]

CSO: 5200/1314

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS CITES JAPANESE PAPER ON U.S. PACIFIC CHEMICAL WAR PLANS

LD091539 Moscow TASS in English 1335 GMT 9 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS -- TASS news analyst Valentin Vasilets writes:

The Pentagon is preparing for chemical warfare. Such a statement invariably draws cries of indignation from official circles in Washington. Nevertheless it is being backed up by real content. Chemical warfare is regarded at U.S. military-strategic centres as a global war. In any case, such is the character of preparations for it.

As is reported by the Japanese newspaper SHAKAI SHIMPO, the USA is now creating a military-chemical complex in the heart of the Pacific. A big storage for 13,000 chemical bombs is being built on Johnston Atoll (1,100 kilometres to the south-west of the Hawaii Islands). The danger of keeping such chemical stockpiles is so great that the introduction of chemical bombs in the territory of the USA itself is banned categorically. The ban of American "humanists" does not extend, of course, to foreign territories: Chemical bombs were kept on the Japanese island of Okinawa until 1971.

The truthfulness of the SHAKAI SHIMPO report can hardly be questioned. Firstly, it contains sufficiently many trustworthy details. Secondly -- and this is the main thing -- the news concerning Johnston Atoll fits well into the general military policy of the USA, a policy of which a large-scale programme for the equipment of the Pentagon's military machine with chemical weapons is one of major elements. Already at this stage the United States has the world's biggest arsenal of chemical weapons. It is known that over 90 types of such weapons are kept at army depots in the continental part of the USA. Toxic agents are corked up in three million units of munition of various purpose. To this it is planned to add 2 million more aviation bombs, artillery shells and mines. The Pentagon heavily relies on binary weapons consisting of two components which form a toxic substance when combined. Such weapons are now being imposed on the West European allies of the USA.

As might be expected, the chemical rearmament of the American Armed Forces is being accompanied with anti-Soviet rhetoric. The more money is allocated in the USA for these purposes the louder and more shameless is rhetoric concerning the mythical "Soviet menace." While preparing for chemical warfare the United States refuses to discuss the Soviet Union's draft convention on a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons.

Indeed the "chemicalization" of the Armed Forces of the USA is being carried out not in response to any actions by the Soviet Union and jeopardizes not only the Soviet Union's security. It is quite clear that a chemical danger is gathering over the peoples of the vast Pacific Basin in addition to the nuclear danger. It should be underlined that the nuclear danger is far from being a myth and is not a matter of the future only. This is reality, borne out not only by Hiroshima and Nagasaki. American nuclear weapon tests on Pacific atolls have also done great harm to the peoples inhabiting them. At present a chemical threat is also becoming a reality.

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: GREEK CALL FOR BALKAN ZONE CITED

Papandreou Speech

PM251806 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent N. Miroshnik dispatch: "Greece: The New Cabinet's Program"]

[Excerpt] Athens, 24 Jun--"The development of cooperation and friendship with all states, loyalty to the principle of the peaceful solution of international disputes, the reduction of seats of tension in the world, and an effective contribution to the cause of detente and peace remain the paramount concerns of the government," Prime Minister A. Papandreou of Greece declared in his speech to parliament. He presented the program of the government formed by him following the Panhellenic Socialist Movement Party's victory at the 2 June early parliamentary elections. The cornerstone of the government's strategy, A. Papandreou noted, has been and remains the consolidation of national independence and the safeguarding of Greece's territorial integrity. Within this framework it will continue to implement a multifaceted foreign policy.

Speaking about mutual relations with the Balkan Peninsula states, the prime minister noted that his government will strive, as before, to develop stable friendship and constructive cooperation with all of them and to advance the idea of establishing a nuclear-free zone in the region. At the same time, as observers note, the program declaration makes no mention at all of any of the former promises to remove from Greece the nuclear weapons deployed on its territory. As for the U.S. military bases, A Papandreou indicated that the government is fully resolved "to adhere to the conditions and timetable laid down in this agreement." It is well known that the 1983 Greek-American agreement provides for the removal of U.S. military bases from the country.

# Protests Against U.S. Bases

LD161356 Moscow TASS in English 1349 GMT 16 Jul 85

[Text] Athens July 16 TASS -- A press-conference, which was held here on the initiative of the pan-Hellenic Committee of Struggle for Dismantling Foreign Military Bases was devoted to questions of stepping up actions of protest in Greece against the American military presence. The struggle against U.S. military presence, stressed participants in the press-conference, are part of the struggle for national independence and peace. It is directly linked with the Balkan Peninsula's becoming a nuclear-free zone.

Stressed at the press-conference was the need of building up struggle of the peace forces of Greece for withdrawal of the U.S. bases from Greek soil.

A march of protest was held here on the initiative of the Youth Peace committee. Its participants marched to the American base in Neo-Makri and chanted the slogans "No to Reagan's star wars plans", "Down with American bases", "Yes to nuclear-free balkans". A mammoth meeting was held outside the base. At the meeting the call was made for the younger generation of Greece to join the movement in defence of peaceful future of the planet.

CSO: 5200/1311

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: NEW ZEALAND PLANS LAW BANNING NUCLEAR-CAPABLE WARSHIPS

LD080910 Moscow TASS in English 0838 GMT 8 Jul 85

[Text] London, 8 Jul (TASS)--New Zealand intends to enshrine its ban on nuclear-capable warships in legislation, Prime Minister David Lange said today. According to the prime minister, REUTER reports, the legislation planned to be adopted by the end of the year, will also cover a proposed south Pacific nuclear-free zone being discussed by regional governments. The idea of establishing in the region a zone free from nuclear weapons received support of many Pacific states.

Observers note that David Lange's statement is yet another confirmation of the determination of New Zealand's government to bar foreign nuclear-capable ships from territorial waters of the country, despite the powerful pressure on the part of Washington which regards that as a threat to realisation of its global nuclear ambitions.

CSO: 5200/1311

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW ON JULY ANZUS MEETING: 'ANTI-NUCLEAR CHAIN REACTION' SEEN

LD151546 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 15 Jul 85

[Text] United States Secretary of State Shultz, who is now in Australia, met Prime Minister Hawke, and had a first round of talks with Foreign Affairs Minister Hayden. Central to the talks is the question of the future of ANZUS bloc, which Australia and New Zealand are members as well as the United States. This commentary is presented by Vladimir Beloshapko.

[Beloshapke] Debates among the participants of this military bloc have increased noticeably. I want to remind you that tempers flared at the decision of the New Zealand Labor Government, under the leadership of Prime Minister Lange, not to allow U.S. warships with nuclear-powered engines or with nuclear armaments on board into New Zealand ports or territorial waters. Because the Pentagon categorically refuses to admit or deny the fact of nuclear armament presence on American ships, all of them are now being denied entry into New Zealand ports. Such disobedience, especially on the part of an ally, was considered intolerable in White House. Moreover, as the experts note, alarm in Washington was caused not only and even not so much by military aspects of this problem. The Pacific Ocean fleet can manage in principle without New Zealand. It was the political side of the question that was put foremost. The thing is that the antinuclear course of Wellington creates quite a dangerous precedent for the United States. As is known, in the Asian region of the Pacific Ocean the number of people supporting turning of some of its regions into nuclear-free zones is noticeably increasing. Such moods are strong in public and political circles of Japan, Australia, and other countries, as the scale of antiwar movements in these states shows. Under such conditions Wellington's action may cause an anti-nuclear chain reaction, which does not coincide in any way with military strategic plans of Pentagon--plans that envisage the saturation of Asia and of seas and oceans, that are washing the shores of the continent, with nuclear weapons and devices for their delivery. This is why the United States is using all means in order to force the Lange Government to change their policy in the nuclear field. Washington cancelled annual meeting of the heads of foreign policy departments of ANZUS countries, and reduced contacts with New Zealand in the military field. At the same time the United States is threatening it with trade economic retributions. Judging by what is being discussed at American-Australian talks in Canberra, State Secretary Shultz decided to personally continue this policy of crude pressure and blackmail toward sovereign states of the region.

CSO: 5200/1311



5 August 1985

## NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

## IZVESTIYA COMMENTARY ON INDIAN OCEAN PEACE ZONE

PM110917 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jul 85 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Vladimir Kudryavtsev "Political Observer's Opinion": "Peace for the Indian Ocean"]

[Text] The imperialist policy of creating hotbeds of military danger has not overlooked the Indian Ocean. Hotbeds have become more or less permanent in the Near East, the Persian Gulf zone, and southern Africa. A troubled atmosphere also prevails in Southeast Asia, where Thailand has been turned into a bridgehead for provocations against Cambodia. All this put together creates international tension throughout the Indian Ocean region.

There exists the constant possibility both of the widening of existing hotbeds of military danger and of the emergence of new ones. As was pointed out during Indian Prime Minister R. Gandhi's recent visit to the Soviet Union, the problems of ensuring peace and security in Asia today are probably no less and in individual regions are more acute and painful than in Europe. And the Indian Ocean region can undoubtedly be counted among these regions.

Of course, the imperialists do not voice their claims openly. But this does not mean that the U.S. ruling circles do not lay claim to supremacy in the Indian Ocean and to its use in their strategic plans. Their aim is to turn the Indian Ocean into a link connecting the American bridgeheads in the Pacific and the Atlantic.

On the other hand, it must be seen that a number of factors hinder the realization of these sinister designs. An important role here belongs to the Nonaligned Movement, which advocates turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. This movement's potential is determined by the fact that 36 independent states are located on the shores of the Indian Ocean, the overwhelming majority of them colonies of imperialist powers only recently liberated in historical terms and which reject membership in military blocs. The fact that many peoples there have ancient cultures and statehood also cannot be disregarded. They have made a great contribution to the treasure house of general human culture. They have something with which to counter the dubious values of the "American way of life," which the Washington administration publicizes so hard and tries to impose on other peoples.

Under the conditions which have now taken shape all the countries of that region, with few exceptions, need guaranteed peace to strengthen their statehood and economic independence. So it was no coincidence that as long ago as 1970 the conference of non-aligned countries' heads of state and government in Lusaka put forward the idea of turn-

ing the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. The nonaligned countries' initiative was supported by the UN General Assembly, which in 1971 adopted a declaration proclaiming the Indian Ocean a zone of peace and decided in that connection to convene an international conference on the Indian Ocean in Colombo in 1981. The significance which the United Nations attached to the idea of turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace was underlined by the creation of the UN Special Committee on the Indian Ocean, which was to draw up a plan of specific measures for the practical implementation of that idea.

These measures were to be based on preventing the ocean from being turned into an arena of the arms race and a bridgehead threatening the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of the countries located in the region. However, the United States did everything in its power to prevent the convening of an international conference. It also scorned the Soviet Union's important initiative to accelerate the ocean's transformation into a zone of peace. In 1977 the Soviet Union proposed to the United States the holding of bilateral talks on limiting military activity in the Indian Ocean basin. However, after the fourth round of talks the United States unilaterally broke them off without any substantial grounds for doing so. With that step the United States finally revealed its hand, showing that its policy is aimed at turning the Indian Ocean into a bridgehead against the Soviet Union and those countries which refuse to follow U.S. diktat. As in other similar cases, the U.S. ruling circles seek to shift the blame for the tense situation onto an innocent party by advancing the absurd thesis of a Soviet threat to U.S. vital interests, even though U.S. territory is separated from the Indian Ocean by many thousands of kilometers.

In its policy with regard to that region the Soviet Union has proceeded and now proceeds from its principled position on questions of war and peace, as well as its support for all countries and peoples which are defending their national independence or have become victims of imperialist aggression. Naturally, the Soviet Union cannot be indifferent to U.S. attempts to turn the Indian Ocean into a bridgehead against its security, particularly taking into account modern military hardware. In addition, account should be taken of the fact that for the Soviet Union the Indian Ocean is the only ice-free sea route linking the European part of the USSR with its Far Eastern regions all year round. Thus, it is more logical for the Soviet Union than for the United States to speak of a threat to its vital interests. This is why the Soviet Union warmly supports the idea advanced by the nonaligned countries and approved by an international forum -- the United Nations -- of turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. It is the Soviet Union's opinion that precisely the idea of convening an international conference on this question has now become the linchpin of the struggle for a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

This is becoming all the more urgent because the U.S. plans to prepare for waging "star wars" attach increasing significance to the Indian Ocean region. As long ago as 1979 the U.S. Congressional Research Service called for American submarines to be deployed in the Indian Ocean region with missiles targeted on the Soviet Union. At the end of last year India's PTI news agency reported that "the U.S. military presence in the Indian Ocean has increased in line with the development and the growing complexity of the technology used to create antisatellite means and arms for space wars." U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger also spoke of antisatellite installations in the Indian Ocean region during the discussion in Congress of the military budget for 1985. Nor must we forget the constant presence in the Indian Ocean of ships of the U.S. 7th Fleet and the extension (since 1978) of the operational zone of the aggressive ANZUS bloc (United States, Australia, and New Zealand) to the Indian Ocean.

In the light of these and many other facts it becomes clear why the United States wrecked the bilateral talks with the Soviet Union on the question of limiting military measures in the Indian Ocean and why it is totally opposed to convening an international conference on the Indian Ocean. Because a conference will raise in practice the question of liquidating all foreign military bases in that region and preventing any attempts to increase the foreign military presence. It follows from this that the question of liquidating the American multirole military base on Diego Garcia Island, which is increasingly becoming the central mainstay of American imperialism in the Indian Ocean, must also be discussed. In addition to the fact that the base on Diego Garcia poses a constant threat to peace, it is an example of the flagrant violation of international legal norms by the United States and also by Britain. It is known that Britain illegally handed over to the United States the Chagos Archipelago, which belongs to the State of Mauritius, together with Diego Garcia Island, which is part of it. The archipelago must be returned to its owner. The Soviet Union, India, and many other countries support Mauritius' just demands for the Chagos Archipelago to be returned to it.

At its 39th session the UN General Assembly confirmed the mandate of the Special Committee on the Indian Ocean and entrusted it with completing work on preparing for an international conference so that it can be convened in the first half of 1986.

The Indian Ocean must become a zone of peace in the interests of the peoples inhabiting its shores, in the interests of world peace.

CSO: 5200/1311

## NUCLEAR TESTING

### U.S. CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION APPEALS FOR MORATORIUM

#### Gorbachev Replies

LD050601 Moscow TASS in Russian 0555 GMT 5 Jul 85

[Text] Washington July 5 TASS -- Today's PRAVDA published the following TASS report:

Anatoliy Dobrynin, the USSR's ambassador to the United States, has handed over to Rear-Admiral (Ret.) Gene La Rocque, director of the Washington-based Center for Defense Information, a reply to his letter addressed to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and calling on the USSR to declare a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests.

Putting an end to such tests, the reply said, would be a very important step in the overall process of limiting and reducing nuclear arms. The Soviet Union believes the task is feasible. The USSR has proposed to the United States more than once that the tripartite talks on this score (involving also Britain) be resumed. It has also repeatedly suggested to all nuclear powers that a moratorium be announced, with a view to creating a favorable atmosphere for working out a relevant agreement, on all nuclear explosions starting from a mutually-agreed date.

The Soviet Union still stands for the date to be, for example, August 6, 1985 that is the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, or another, even earlier day which the nuclear powers would agree upon. The moratorium would remain in force until the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty.

Regrettably, the U.S. Administration has not displayed any readiness to move in this direction. And it is known why. The official spokesmen for the incumbent U.S. Government say bluntly that the nuclear tests will be continued since they are essential to upgrading the existing and manufacturing new nuclear warheads.

It is also known that Washington has stubbornly refused to follow the lead of the Soviet Union and match the USSR's unilateral moves by pledging not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, not to launch anti-satellite weapons into space, and stop the deployment of its new nuclear missiles in Western Europe in response to the Soviet Union's terminated buildup of its counter-measures.

The American side, the reply said, does not intend to respond to the USSR's demonstrated good will. And the Soviet Union cannot ignore this. Its security interests dictate the limits it cannot transcend unilaterally. It should be understandable that there is a real way, and that is the way of joint and constructive actions by nuclear weapons

powers. For its part, the Soviet Union will continue facilitating a turn in this direction with all its policy also in future.

It is no less important, however, the reply said, that the peace-loving public in all countries, in the first place in the United States, also say its weighty word and make the governments resisting an end to the arms race heed the voice of reason.

In conclusion the reply wished successes to all in the United States, who act from these positions.

Gene La Rocque expressed deep gratitude for the reply to his letter.

#### Moscow TV Interviews La Rocque

LD052320 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1550 GMT 5 Jul 85

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] As already reported, Comrade Dobrynin, the USSR ambassador in the U.S., has handed to Rear Admiral Gene La Rocque, retired, director of the Washington Center for Defense Information, a reply to his letter to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, calling on the USSR to declare a moratorium on nuclear arms tests. In his interview to Soviet television Gene La Rocque said:

[[Begin recording] [La Rocque in English with Russian translation] It is a great honor to receive the answer from General Secretary Gorbachev. The content of the answer turned out to be even more exciting, because he confirmed the USSR position speaking out against the arms race and for preventing the threat of nuclear war. He also clearly stated that while the Soviet Union is striving for an accord in the field of arms control, the U.S. does not show such a desire.

[Correspondent] The news about the Soviet-American summit meeting this autumn was just now declared. How do you evaluate this?

[La Rocque] My colleagues and I have for several years been urging President Reagan to meet the Soviet leaders. We are glad that at last such a meeting will take place. I think that this is an excellent step forward, when the leaders of the two leading countries of the world will sit together and discuss the possibilities of improving relations. I think the most important result of the meeting between Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan in Geneva will be a better mutual understanding between the leaders and between the countries. If we want to avoid nuclear war, the leaders of our states as well as our peoples must get to know each other better, because it is not we who are enemies, but nuclear war that is our mutual enemy. [end recording]

#### TASS Cites Research Paper

LD051721 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 5 Jul 85

[Text] Washington, 5 Jul (TASS)--TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

The Center of Defence Information, a prestigious Washington public organisation, has declared for taking measures without delay to ban nuclear weapons tests. The speediest conclusion of a treaty between all the nuclear powers, above all between the U.S.A. and the USSR, on a simultaneous termination of nuclear weapons tests, would be a far-reaching step in the direction of the limitation of the arms race, says the research paper issued by the organisation. Moreover, such measures would considerably facilitate the drafting and implementation of other agreements and treaties with the aim of not only putting an end to the arms race, but also of reversing it.

The authors of the research paper recall that the problem of termination of nuclear weapons tests remains outstanding because of the obstructionist policy of the U.S.A., which in 1982 unilaterally walked out of the talks between the USSR, the U.S.A. and Britain on drafting a treaty on complete and general ban on nuclear weapons tests.

The leading officials of the Center of Defence Information addressed President Reagan and General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev with a call to introduce a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests beginning from 6 August, 1985.

The Soviet Union informed that it favours, as before, that such a moratorium be introduced, for example, from 6 August or even earlier, at a time on which agreement would be reached by the nuclear powers. The moratorium would be in effect until a treaty on complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests was concluded. Yet the White House has rejected that call.

#### Moscow Hits U.S. Attitude

LD061501 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 6 Jul 85

[Excerpts] Antiwar movements, prominent political and public leaders and scientists of many countries are acting more and more vigorously for a ban on nuclear arms tests. It stands to reason that the solution of this pressing problem is linked above all with the position of the countries that possess such arms. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, its point of view has been outlined again in a document handed over a few days ago by the Soviet Embassy in the United States to Gene Larocque, a retired rear admiral who is director of the Defense Information Center in Washington. The document is a reply to a letter from Gene Larocque to the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev, urging the Soviet Union to announce a moratorium on nuclear arms tests.

Unfortunately, the United States administration does not show willingness to move along this road. Its representatives declare officially that nuclear tests will be carried on, since, allegedly, they are necessary to improve the new nuclear warheads that are being produced today. This stand coincides with the negative attitude of Washington to other Soviet initiatives. The United States stubbornly refuses to follow the Soviet Union's example and take unilateral steps, that is, a pledge not to use nuclear weapons first,

not to introduce anti-satellite weapons in outer space and to stop the deployment of its new nuclear missiles in Western Europe, in response to the Soviet Union's stop as of last April in the build up of retaliatory measures.

The Soviet Union cannot ignore the refusal of the United States to respond to its good will. The interests of the Soviet Union's security dictate limits beyond which it cannot move unilaterally. There is a real path: a path of joint constructive actions by the powers that possess nuclear weapons. For its part the Soviet Union will strive in its policies to bring about a change in this direction.

CSO: 5200/1309

END